

COMBINATORIAL PROPERTIES OF NIL-BOHR SETS

JAKUB KONIECZNY

ABSTRACT. In this paper we study the relation between two notions of largeness that apply to a set of positive integers, namely $\text{Nil}_d\text{-Bohr}_0$ and SG_k^* , as introduced by Host and Kra [HK11]. We prove that any $\text{Nil}_d\text{-Bohr}_0$ set is necessarily SG_k^* where k is effectively bounded in terms of d . This partially resolves a conjecture of Host and Kra.

1. INTRODUCTION

Among the basic problems in additive combinatorics is the study of various notions of *largeness* which may apply to a set of integers. In this paper we are specifically interested in one such notion, namely that of being a $\text{Nil}_d\text{-Bohr}$ set, or a set of recurrence times for a d -step nilrotation (see 1.2).

The study of these sets was pioneered by Host and Kra [HK11], with later developments due to Huang, Shao and Ye [HSY14]. In [HK11], it was realised that $\text{Nil}_d\text{-Bohr}$ sets bear a striking relation to a purely combinatorial class of SG_k^* sets (see 1.4). Namely, it was shown that a SG_d^* set is piecewise- $\text{Nil}_d\text{-Bohr}$. Here, we prove the reverse implication, although in a weaker form.

Even though a proper motivation for our results requires more context, we are able to express some of them in relatively basic terms. Our first result is the following.

Theorem A. *Fix an polynomial $p \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ with $p(0) = 0$ of degree d , and a sequence $(n_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ of positive integers. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a finite, non-empty set $\alpha \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, with gaps bounded by d , such that $\|p(\sum_{i \in \alpha} n_i)\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq \varepsilon$.*

From now on, let us denote by $\mathcal{F}$ the family of all finite non-empty subsets of $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$. For an set $\alpha = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_r\}$, where $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_r$, the *gaps* of α are the integers $i_2 - i_1, i_3 - i_2, \dots, i_r - i_{r-1}$. It is customary to denote elements of $\mathcal{F}$ by lowercase Greek letters $\alpha, \beta, \dots$. Bootstrapping (a slight modification of) the above result, we obtain a recurrence statement for nilrotations.

Theorem B. *Let G be a d -step nilpotent Lie group and let $\Gamma < G$ be a cocompact, discrete subgroup. Fix $g \in G$, an open neighbourhood $e\Gamma \in U \subseteq G/\Gamma$, as well as a sequence $(n_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ of positive integers.*

Then, there exists $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$ with gaps bounded by $\binom{d+1}{2}$, such that $g^{\sum_{i \in \alpha} n_i} \in U\Gamma$.

1.1. Bohr sets. The notion of a Bohr (or Bohr_0) set is classical and well-studied. A set $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is said to be a Bohr set if it contains the preimage of an open, non-empty set U through the natural embedding of $\mathbb{N}$ in the Bohr compactification of $\mathbb{Z}$, usually denoted $b\mathbb{Z}$. Accordingly, A is a Bohr_0 set if additionally $0 \in U$.

While very satisfying from the categorical point of view, the above definition gives limited idea of what a Bohr set looks like. A more concrete description is possible.

Namely, a set is Bohr if it contains a non-empty set of the form $\{n \in \mathbb{N} : n\alpha \in U\}$ where $\alpha \in \mathbb{T}^m = \mathbb{R}^m/\mathbb{Z}^m$ and $U \subseteq \mathbb{T}^m$ is open; A is Bohr_0 if additionally $0 \in U$. Hence, Bohr_0 sets can be viewed dynamically as a return-times sets for the point $0 \in \mathbb{T}^m$, where the dynamics are given by $x \mapsto x + \alpha$.

(Note that we construe being a Bohr set as a notion of largeness, hence above we only insist on containment, rather than equality. In context when precise structure is important, different definitions are used, see e.g. [TV06, Section 4.4].)

1.2. Nil–Bohr sets. With the advent of higher-order Fourier analysis, a natural analogue of the class of Bohr sets has come into view. The role of the circle rotations in classical Fourier analysis is now played by *nilrotations*, which we presently define.

Suppose that G is a d -step nilpotent Lie group, and let $\Gamma < G$ be a cocompact and discrete subgroup. Here, by *cocompact* we simply mean that the quotient space G/Γ should be compact. The space $X = G/\Gamma$ is a d -step *nilmanifold* and carries a natural action of G , given by $g.x\Gamma = (gx)\Gamma$. There exists a unique Haar measure μ on the Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}(X)$, which is preserved by all translations $T_g : x\Gamma \mapsto g.x\Gamma$. Hence, for any $g \in G$, translation by g is a measure-preserving transformation of (X, μ) . We call any such system $(X, \mathcal{B}(X), \mu, T_g)$ a d -step *nilrotation*.

We now define a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ to be a Nil_d -Bohr set, in analogy to the abelian case, if it contains a non-empty set of the form

$$\{n \in \mathbb{N} : g^n \Gamma \in U\}$$

where G/Γ is a d -step nilmanifold, and $U \subseteq G/\Gamma$ is open. If additionally $e\Gamma \in U$ then A is a Nil_d -Bohr $_0$ set.

A useful example to keep in mind are sets of the form:

$$\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \|p(n)\| \leq \varepsilon\},$$

where $p \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ is a polynomial with at least one irrational non-constant coefficient. In general, such sets are Nil_d -Bohr. If additionally $p(0) = 0$ then they are Nil_d -Bohr $_0$. (This can be seen by a classical construction, which is discussed for instance in [BL07, Section 0.16].)

1.3. IP sets. Another classical notion of largeness which is relevant to us is IP. For a sequence $(n_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, we define the set of finite sums of A ,

$$(1) \quad \text{FS}(n_i) = \left\{ \sum_{i \in \alpha} n_i : \alpha \in \mathcal{F} \right\}.$$

For brevity of notation, it is convenient to define in this context $n_\alpha := \sum_{i \in \alpha} n_i$ for $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$; this is consistent with the natural inclusion $\mathbb{N} \ni i \mapsto \{i\} \in \mathcal{F}$.

A set $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is said to be an IP set if there exists a sequence $(n_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\text{FS}(n_i) \subseteq A$. Once again, we remark that since we view IP as a notion of largeness, we only require A to contain a set of finite sums (as opposed to being equal to such a set). This is consistent with usage e.g. in [BFW06], but different from the original definition in [FW78].

1.4. SG sets. In analogy to the IP sets $\text{FS}(n_i)$, we define for $k \geq 0$ the sets $\text{SG}_k(n_i)$, where the index sets are additionally required to have bounded gaps. Let $\mathcal{S}_k \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ denote the set of finite sets of integers $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$, whose gaps are bounded by k ; we might call such sets k -syndetic. In other words, we require that for any $i \in \alpha$, either $i = \max \alpha$, or there exists $j \in \alpha$ with $i < j \leq i + k$. We allow the degenerate

case $k = 0$, where $\mathcal{S}_0 = \mathbb{N}$ (up to identification $i \mapsto \{i\}$). For a sequence of integers $(n_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ we put

$$(2) \quad \text{SG}_k(n_i) = \left\{ \sum_{i \in \alpha} n_i : \alpha \in \mathcal{S}_k \right\}.$$

In analogy with IP sets, we define a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ to be a SG_k set if it contains a set of the form $\text{SG}_k(n_i)$ for some sequence n_i . To the best of our knowledge, this definition first appears in [HK11]. We have an obvious chain of inclusions $\text{SG}_1(n_i) \subseteq \text{SG}_2(n_i) \subseteq \dots \subseteq \text{FS}(n_i)$, whence $\text{SG}_1 \supseteq \text{SG}_2 \supseteq \dots \supseteq \text{IP}$.

The simplest non-degenerate example, though possibly a misleading one, is when $k = 1$. Then $\text{SG}_k(n_i)$ consists precisely of the consecutive sums $\sum_{i=u}^v n_i$, and it has been noted that $\text{SG}_1(n_i) = \Delta(S) := (S - S) \cap \mathbb{N}$ where $S = \{\sum_{i=1}^v n_i : v \in \mathbb{N}\}$. It is not difficult to see that conversely, any set of the form $\Delta(S)$ as above can be expressed as $\text{SG}_1(n_i)$ for some sequence (n_i) . Thus, SG_1 sets coincide with the well-studied class of Δ sets (see also [BFW06]).

1.5. Dual classes. For a class $\mathcal{C}$ of subsets of $\mathbb{N}$, we define the *dual* class $\mathcal{C}^*$ by declaring that $B \in \mathcal{C}^*$ if and only if for any $A \in \mathcal{C}$ the sets A and B intersect non-trivially: $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$ (see e.g. [Fur81, Section 9.1]).

Specifically, we define the class SG_k^* , consisting of the sets $B \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that for any choice of integers $(n_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, there exists some $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$ with $n_\alpha \in B$. We note the reversed chain of inclusions: $\text{SG}_1^* \subseteq \text{SG}_2^* \subseteq \dots \subseteq \text{IP}^*$.

It is clear by definition that for any class $\mathcal{C}$, the dual class $\mathcal{C}^*$ is closed under taking supersets. The operation of taking the dual reverses the inclusion: if $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ then $\mathcal{C}^* \supseteq \mathcal{D}^*$. If $\mathcal{C}$ is partition regular, then $\mathcal{C}^*$ is easily seen to be closed under finite intersections, but $\mathcal{C}^*$ will not generally be partition regular [Fur81, Lemma 9.5]. If additionally $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{C}$ then $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{C}^*$ [Fur81, Lemma 9.4]. We cite the latter two facts merely to provide context, they are not used at any point.

1.6. Nil-Bohr sets vs. SG sets. As noted earlier, there is a somewhat unexpected connection between the a priori unrelated notions of SG_k^* sets and Nil_d -Bohr sets.

Following the usual convention, we say that a set A is piecewise Nil_d -Bohr₀ if there exists a thick set T (i.e. such that T contains arbitrarily long intervals) and a Nil_d -Bohr₀ set B such that $A = B \cap T$. It was proved in [HK11] that any SG_d^* set is piecewise Nil_d -Bohr₀. (In fact, the result proved there is slightly stronger, with a more rigid notion of “strongly piecewise”.) The following question arises naturally:

Question 1. Is any Nil_d -Bohr₀ set a SG_d^* set?

The main purpose of this paper is to answer a weaker variant of this question. The reader will have no problem checking that the following is merely a succinct restatement of Theorem B.

Theorem 1.1. *Any Nil_d -Bohr₀ set is SG_k^* , provided that $k \geq \binom{d+1}{2}$.*

Remark 1.2. We note that a weaker variant of theorem, with SG_k^* replaced with IP^* , is true for much simpler (or at least better studied) reasons. It can be checked that any nilrotation is distal [AHG⁺63, Key66a, Key66b]. More explicitly, for any nilrotation $(T_g, G/\Gamma)$ with metric $d_{G/\Gamma}$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $x, y \in G/\Gamma$ are two points with $d_{G/\Gamma}(x, y) > \varepsilon$ then for all n also

$d_{G/\Gamma}(T_g^n x, T_g^n y) > \delta$. On the other hand, for any topological dynamical system (T, X) distality is equivalent to the condition that for any $x \in X$ and any open neighbourhood $U \ni x$, the set $\{n : T^n x \in U\}$ is IP* [Fur81, Lemma 9.5]. Since any $\text{Nil}_d\text{-Bohr}_0$ is (a superset of) a set of precisely this form, the claim follows. (A similar argument can be found in [BL07].)

Notation. By $\mathbb{N}$ we denote the set $\{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$; in particular $0 \notin \mathbb{N}$. We put $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$.

By $\mathcal{F}$ we denote the partial semigroup of the finite, non-empty subsets of integers, where the operation is the disjoint union. We also put $\mathcal{F}_\emptyset = \mathcal{F} \cup \{\emptyset\}$. Hence, whenever the symbol $\alpha \cup \beta$ is used for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{F}$ it is implicitly assumed that α and β need to be disjoint.

If G is a group equipped with a metric, then $\|g\|$ denotes the distance from g to e_G . In particular, for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\|x\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}$ denotes the distance of x from the closest integer.

Standard asymptotic notation, such as $O(\cdot)$ and $\Omega(\cdot)$, is occasionally used.

Acknowledgements. The author thanks Freddie Manners for his generous help with the finer points of the theory of polynomial mappings to nilmanifolds, and Ben Green for much useful advice during the work on this project. Thanks go also to Sean Eberhard, Rudi Mrazović, Przemek Mazur and Aled Walker for many informal discussions.

This research was supported by the National Science Centre (NCN) under grant no. 2012/07/E/ST1/00185.

2. POLYNOMIAL MAPS

In order to prove Theorem B, we need a good understanding of “linear” maps of the form $n \mapsto g^n \Gamma$ from $\mathbb{N}$ to a nilmanifold G/Γ , or even of the form $\alpha \mapsto g^{n_\alpha} \Gamma$, where $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$. It turns out that it is natural to work with the more general class of *polynomial* maps, which we will presently define. The reason to assume this more general approach is that the “linear” sequences lack various closure properties, such as closure under products and pointwise limits. Most of the material covered in this section can be found in other sources, but we recall for the convenience of the reader, and to fix notation. For an accessible introduction, we refer to [Gre15].

2.1. Filtered groups. A Lie *prefiltration* on a Lie group G is a descending sequence $G_\bullet$ of Lie subgroups of G such that $G = G_0 \supseteq G_1 \supseteq G_2 \supseteq \dots$ and for any i, j we have the nesting condition $[G_i, G_j] \subseteq G_{i+j}$. We always assume that the prefiltration terminates at some point, in the sense that for some d we have $G_{d+1} = \{e_G\}$. The least such d is the *length* of the filtration. A Lie *filtration* is a prefiltration $G_\bullet$ such that additionally $G_0 = G_1 = G$. Since we have no need to consider filtrations which are not Lie, we will usually omit this adjective. We may also keep the group G implicit, and assume that $G = G_0$.

The most important example of a filtration to bear in mind is the lower central series given by $G_0 = G_1 = G$ and $G_{i+1} := [G, G_i]$ (where $[G, H]$ denotes the group generated by elements of the form $[g, h]$ with $g \in G$, $h \in H$). If G is d -step nilpotent, then the length of this filtration is d . Conversely, if G has a filtration of length d , then G is at most d -step nilpotent. (Of course, in general the length of a filtration may be greater than the nilpotency class of the group.)

If $G_\bullet$ is a prefiltration, we may construct a prefiltration $G'_i := G_{i+1}$. (Note that the nesting property is clear.) We denote this new prefiltration by $G_{\bullet+1}$.

2.2. Polynomial sequences. As alluded to before, we wish to study maps from $\mathcal{F}$ (or $\mathcal{F}_0$) into a nilmanifold G/Γ , taking a rather specific form $\alpha \mapsto g^{n_\alpha} \Gamma$. It will be convenient to introduce a more general notion of a polynomial sequence from a general partial semigroup into a filtered group.

Recall that a partial semigroup $(\mathcal{A}, *)$ is a set $\mathcal{A}$ equipped with a binary operation $*$ defined on a subset of $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}$, such that $\alpha * (\beta * \gamma) = (\alpha * \beta) * \gamma$, whenever both sides are defined. By the usual abuse of notation, we usually refer to the set $\mathcal{A}$ alone as a semigroup, keeping the operation $*$ implicit. We are mostly interested in the case $(\mathcal{A}, *) = (\mathcal{F}_0, \cup)$.

There are several equivalent ways of defining polynomial maps between groups. Here, we follow the discussion of Zorin-Kranich [ZK12, ZK13], which is based upon the foundational work of Leibman [Lei98, Lei02].

Definition 2.1 (Polynomial sequence; Def. 1.21 in [ZK13]). Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an partial semigroup, and let $G_\bullet$ be a prefiltration on a nilpotent Lie group G . Then a map $g: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow G$ is declared to be polynomial (with respect to $G_\bullet$) if either $G = \{e_G\}$ is trivial and $g(\alpha) = e_G$ is the constant sequence, or if G is non-trivial and for every $\beta \in \mathcal{A}$ there exists a $G_{\bullet+1}$ polynomial $D_\beta g$ such that

$$(3) \quad D_\beta g(\alpha) = g(\alpha)^{-1} g(\alpha * \beta)$$

whenever $\alpha * \beta$ is defined. The set of all such polynomial maps is denoted by $\text{poly}(\mathcal{A} \rightarrow G_\bullet)$.

Theorem 2.2 (Thm. 1.23 in [ZK13]). *Let $G_\bullet$ be a prefiltration and $\mathcal{A}$ a partial semigroup. Then $\text{poly}(\mathcal{A} \rightarrow G_\bullet)$ is a group under pointwise multiplication.*

We are fundamentally interested not in maps $\text{poly}(\mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow G_\bullet)$, but rather in their projections onto G/Γ , where Γ is a discrete cocompact subgroup. In order for such maps to be well behaved, we need to assume that $G_\bullet$ is compatible with Γ . We will say that $G_\bullet$ is Γ -rational if for any i the discrete subgroup $\Gamma_i := G_i \cap \Gamma$ is cocompact. It was shown by Malcev that the lower central series is Γ -rational with respect to any choice of Γ , under the additional assumption that G is simply connected (which we take to mean in particular connected). For the sake of brevity, if $G_\bullet$ is a Lie filtration of length d and Γ is a discrete cocompact subgroup of $G = G_0$ such that $G_\bullet$ is Γ -rational, we will say that $G_\bullet/\Gamma$ is a d -step nilmanifold.

Definition 2.3. Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $G_\bullet$ be as in Definition 2.1, and let Γ be cocompact discrete subgroup of G such that $G_\bullet$ is Γ -rational. Then a map $\bar{g}: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow G/\Gamma$ is declared to be polynomial (with respect to $G_\bullet$) if and only if $\bar{g}$ takes the form $\bar{g} = g \circ \pi$ where $g \in \text{poly}(\mathcal{A} \rightarrow G)$ and $\pi: G \rightarrow G/\Gamma$ is the standard projection $g \mapsto g\Gamma$. The set of all such polynomial maps is denoted by $\text{poly}(\mathcal{A} \rightarrow G_\bullet/\Gamma)$.

We endow $\text{poly}(\mathcal{A} \rightarrow G_\bullet/\Gamma)$ with the topology of pointwise convergence. A crucial advantage of working with polynomial maps onto a nilmanifold is the following compactness property, whose proof we defer.

Theorem 2.4. *In the situation of Definition 2.3, the space $\text{poly}(\mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow G_\bullet/\Gamma)$ is compact in the topology of pointwise convergence.*

We are now ready to formulate a version of Theorem B in the proper generality.

Theorem 2.5 (B, strong version). *Let $G_\bullet/\Gamma$ be a nilmanifold of length d , and let $\bar{f} \in \text{poly}(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset \rightarrow G_\bullet/\Gamma)$ with $f(\emptyset) = e\Gamma$. Then, for any open neighbourhood $e\Gamma \in U \subseteq G/\Gamma$, there exists $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_k$ with $k \leq \binom{d+1}{2}$, such that $\bar{f}(\alpha) \in U$.*

2.3. VIP-systems. A simple but already interesting instance of the above definitions is the abelian one, where $G = \mathbb{R}^m$, $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}^m$ and the filtration is given by

$$G_0 = G_1 = \cdots = G_d = \mathbb{R}^m, \quad G_{d+1} = G_{d+2} = \cdots = \{0\}.$$

In this situation, we will simply speak of a polynomial of degree d and keep the filtration implicit. We denote the set of all polynomial maps from $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathbb{T}^m = \mathbb{R}^m/\mathbb{Z}^m$ by $\text{poly}(\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^m)$.

Such maps are a special case of a more general notion of a VIP-system, introduced in [BFM96], well before the theory of polynomial maps between nilpotent groups flourished. (In our notation, a VIP-system is essentially a polynomial map $\mathcal{F}_\emptyset \rightarrow \Omega$, where Ω is an abelian group.)

The following structural result is well known, see [McC99, Proposition 2.5].

Proposition 2.6 (Structure of polynomials $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^m$). Suppose that $\bar{f}: \mathcal{F}_\emptyset \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^m$ is a polynomial of degree d . Then $\bar{f}$ admits a representation of the form:

$$(4) \quad \bar{f}(\alpha) = \sum_{\substack{\gamma \subseteq \alpha \\ |\gamma| \leq d}} a_\gamma,$$

where $a_\gamma \in \mathbb{T}^m$ are constants. Conversely, any map of the form (4) is a polynomial of degree $\leq d$.

Proof. Suppose first that $\bar{f}$ takes the form (4). The discrete difference relation $\Delta_\beta \bar{f} = \bar{f}(\alpha \cup \beta) - \bar{f}(\alpha)$ of (3) is satisfied for

$$\Delta_\beta \bar{f}(\alpha) := \sum_{\substack{\gamma \subseteq \alpha \\ |\delta| \leq d-1}} \sum_{\substack{\delta \subseteq \beta \\ |\varepsilon| \leq d-|\gamma|}} a_{\gamma \cup \delta},$$

which is again of the form (4) with degree $d-1$. By a standard inductive argument, $\bar{f}$ is hence verified to be a polynomial of degree at most d .

Conversely, let $\bar{f}: \mathcal{F}_\emptyset \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^m$ be a polynomial of degree $\leq d$. By an inclusion-exclusion argument, it is easy to construct $\bar{g}$ of the form (4) such that $\bar{f}(\alpha) = \bar{g}(\alpha)$ if $|\alpha| \leq d$. Hence, replacing $\bar{f}$ with $\bar{f} - \bar{g}$ if necessary, we may assume that $\bar{f}(\alpha) = 0$ whenever $|\alpha| \leq d$.

We prove by induction on $|\alpha|$ that $\bar{f}(\alpha) = 0$. For $|\alpha| \leq d$, we are done, so suppose that the claim holds when $|\alpha| \leq n$ for some $n \geq d$. Choose any β with $|\beta| = 1$. By the Definition 2.1, there is a polynomial $\Delta_\beta \bar{f}$ of degree $d-1$ such that

$$\Delta_\beta \bar{f}(\alpha) = \bar{f}(\alpha \cup \beta) - \bar{f}(\alpha),$$

for $\alpha \cap \beta = \emptyset$. Using the inductive assumption for $d-1$, we know that

$$\Delta_\beta \bar{f}(\alpha) = \sum_{\substack{\gamma \subseteq \alpha \\ |\gamma| \leq d-1}} b_\gamma,$$

for some constants b_γ . For $|\alpha| \leq d-1$, $\alpha \cap \beta = \emptyset$, we have $\Delta_\beta \bar{f}(\alpha) = 0$. Hence, an inclusion-exclusion argument yields $b_\gamma = 0$ for all γ with $\gamma \cap \beta = \emptyset$. Now, picking α with $|\alpha| = n$, $\alpha \cap \beta = \emptyset$ we have:

$$f(\alpha \cup \beta) = f(\alpha) + \Delta_\beta \bar{f}(\alpha) = 0,$$

so the inductive claim remains true for $n + 1$. $\square$

2.4. Host-Kra cube groups. A useful approach to polynomial maps is obtained by introducing a notion of *Host-Kra cube*, or more generally *cube group* $\text{HK}^k(G_\bullet)$. This notion was first introduced (thought with a different name) by Host and Kra in [HK11], and is extensively used in a number of papers, including [GT10, GT12]. It is also a basis for the work of Szegedy and Camarena [CS10] later refined by Manners, Gutman and Varjú [].

For any k , we may consider the *cube* $\{0, 1\}^k$. It is often convenient to identify $\{0, 1\}^k$ with the powerset $\mathcal{P}([k])$. In particular, $\{0, 1\}^k$ carries a natural order where $\omega \leq \omega'$ if $\omega_i \leq \omega'_i$ for all i .

For $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^k$ and $g \in G$, we define $g^{[\omega]} \in G^{\{0, 1\}^k}$ by

$$g_\sigma^{[\omega]} = \begin{cases} g & \sigma \geq \omega \\ e_G & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Hence, g_σ^ω can be viewed as a cube with entries g on the upper face $\{\sigma \in \{0, 1\}^k : \sigma \geq \omega\}$, and e_G elsewhere.

If $G_\bullet$ is a prefiltration, we further define the *face group* $G^{[\omega]}$ to be the subgroup of $G^{\{0, 1\}^k}$ generated by elements of the form $g^{[\omega]}$ with $g \in G_{|\omega|}$, where $|\omega| := |\{i : \omega_i = 1\}|$. Finally, we define the Host-Kra cube group $\text{HK}^k(G_\bullet)$ to be the group generated by all face groups $G^{[\omega]}$.

Elements of $\text{HK}^k(G_\bullet)$ admit a somewhat simpler description. If we order the elements of $\{0, 1\}^k$ as $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{2^k-1}$ so that if $\omega_i \leq \omega_j$ then $i \leq j$, then any $\mathbf{g} \in \text{HK}^k(G_\bullet)$ can be uniquely expanded as:

$$\mathbf{g} = g_{\omega_1}^{[\omega_1]} g_{\omega_1}^{[\omega_1]} \dots g_{\omega_{2^k}}^{[\omega_{2^k}]},$$

where $g_{\omega_i} \in G_{|\omega_i|}$ ([GT10, Lemma E.4]).

The key reason for interest in the Host-Kra cube group is the characterisation of polynomial maps which they provide. Let $\mathcal{F}_\emptyset^{[k]}$ denote the set of parallelepipeds, i.e. cubes of the form $\{\alpha_\omega\}_{\omega \in \{0, 1\}^k}$ with $\alpha_\omega = \alpha_0 \cup \bigcup_{i \in \omega} \alpha_i$ for some disjoint $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \in \mathcal{F}_\emptyset$.

Proposition 2.7. Let $G_\bullet$ be a filtration of length d , and let Γ be a discrete cocompact subgroup, such that $G_\bullet$ is Γ -rational.

A sequence $f: \mathcal{F}_\emptyset \rightarrow G$ is polynomial in the sense of Definition 2.1 if and only if f maps $\mathcal{F}_\emptyset^{[k]}$ to $\text{HK}^k(G_\bullet)$ for each k .

Proof. This follows by a standard modification of the proof of [GT12, Proposition 6.5]. $\square$

To deal with polynomial maps $\text{poly}(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset \rightarrow G_\bullet/\Gamma)$, we introduce the following nilmanifold analogue of the Host-Kra group. For a filtered group $G_\bullet$ and cocompact discrete Γ , such that $G_\bullet$ is Γ -rational, we define the Host-Kra nilmanifold

$$(5) \quad \text{HK}^k(G_\bullet/\Gamma) := \text{HK}^k(G_\bullet)/(\Gamma^{\{0, 1\}^k} \cap \text{HK}^k(G_\bullet)).$$

It is true but not immediately clear that this definition is well-posed [GT10, E.10]:

Lemma 2.8. Let $G_\bullet$ be a filtration of length d , and let Γ be a discrete cocompact subgroup, such that $G_\bullet$ is Γ -rational.

Then, the space $\text{HK}^k(G_\bullet)/(\Gamma^{\{0, 1\}^k} \cap \text{HK}^k(G_\bullet))$ is compact.

(Note that [GT10] assumes that G is connected and simply connected. However, the only place in the proof of [GT10, E.10] where connectedness is needed is to assert that $G_\bullet$ is Γ -rational, which we assume.)

By a straightforward modification of the argument in [GT10, E.7] we observe the following completion of corners properties. Here, by $\{0, 1\}_*^k$ we denote the cube with missing upper corner $\{0, 1\}^k \setminus \{1^k\}$. Note that any face, i.e. a set of the form $\{\omega \in \{0, 1\}^k : \omega_i = \sigma_i \text{ for } i \in I\}$, can be naturally be identified with $\{0, 1\}^{k-|I|}$.

Lemma 2.9. *Let $G_\bullet$ be a filtration of length d , and let Γ be a discrete cocompact subgroup, such that $G_\bullet$ is Γ -rational. Suppose that $(g_\omega)_{\omega \in \{0, 1\}_*^k}$ is a partial cube in $G_\bullet/\Gamma$, whose restriction any codimension 1 face lies in $\text{HK}^{k-1}(G_\bullet/\Gamma)$. Then there exists g_{1^k} such that $(g_\omega)_{\omega \in \{0, 1\}^k} \in \text{HK}^k(G_\bullet/\Gamma)$.*

Lemma 2.10. *Let $G_\bullet$ be a filtration of length d , and let Γ be a discrete cocompact subgroup, such that $G_\bullet$ is Γ -rational. Suppose that $(g_\omega)_{\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{d+1}} \in \text{HK}^{d+1}(G_\bullet)$ is such that $g_\omega \in \Gamma$ for $\omega \in \{0, 1\}_*^{d+1}$. Then also $g_{1^{d+1}} \in \Gamma$.*

It is easy to see by combining the two lemmas that if in Lemma 2.9 additionally $g_\omega \in \Gamma$ for $\omega \in \{0, 1\}_*^k$, then it is possible to choose $g_{1^k} \in \Gamma$ (although other choices may be possible). We are now ready to prove the analogue of Proposition 2.7.

Proposition 2.11. *Let $G_\bullet$ be a filtration of length d , and let Γ be a discrete cocompact subgroup, such that $G_\bullet$ is Γ -rational.*

A sequence $f: \mathcal{F}_\emptyset \rightarrow G/\Gamma$ is polynomial in the sense of Definition 2.3 if and only if $\bar{f}$ maps $\mathcal{F}_\emptyset^{[k]}$ to $\text{HK}^k(G_\bullet/\Gamma)$ for each k .

Proof. Suppose that $\bar{f}: \mathcal{F}_\emptyset \rightarrow G$. If $\bar{f} = \pi \circ f$ is a polynomial in the sense of Definition 2.3, then $\bar{f}$ maps $\mathcal{F}_\emptyset^{[k]}$ to $\pi(\text{HK}^k(G_\bullet)) = \text{HK}^k(G/\Gamma)$, which proves one implication.

Suppose conversely that $\bar{f}$ maps $\mathcal{F}_\emptyset^{[k]}$ to $\text{HK}^k(G/\Gamma)$ for each k . We aim to construct $f \in \text{poly}(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset \rightarrow G_\bullet)$ such that $\bar{f} = \pi \circ f$. Our construction will be inductive, where $f(\alpha)$ is constructed only after all $f(\beta)$ with $|\beta| < |\alpha|$. To initiate the construction, pick arbitrary $f(\emptyset)$ with $\pi(f(\emptyset)) = \bar{f}(\emptyset)$.

Take arbitrary $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$; we shall construct $f(\alpha)$. Let $\alpha = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k\}$, and write $\alpha_\omega = \{a_i : \omega_i = 1\}$, so that $(\alpha_\omega)_\omega$ defines a parallelepiped. Hence, we have the cube $\bar{\mathbf{h}} = (\bar{f}(\alpha_\omega))_\omega \in \text{HK}^k(G_\bullet/\Gamma)$. By definition, this cube is the projection of some cube $\mathbf{g} = (g_\omega)_\omega \in \text{HK}^k(G_\bullet)$. On the other hand, we have the partial cube $(f(\alpha_\omega))_{\omega \neq 1^k}$. By the corner completion property in Lemma 2.9, this partial cube can be completed to some cube $\mathbf{h} = (h_\omega)_\omega$ with $h_\omega = f(\alpha_\omega)$.

Consider the cube $\mathbf{g}^{-1}\mathbf{h}$. By construction, $g_\omega^{-1}h_\omega \in \Gamma$ for $\omega \neq 1^k$. Using Lemma 2.10 and Lemma 2.9, we may also assume that $g_{1^k}^{-1}h_{1^k} \in \Gamma$. Hence, we also have $\pi(\mathbf{h}) = \bar{\mathbf{h}}$. We may thus assign $f(\alpha) := h_{1^k}$.

This construction guarantees that f maps parallelepipeds of the special form $\alpha_\omega = \{a_i : \omega_i = 1\}$ into the Host-Kra cube groups. Since any parallelepiped can be embedded into one of this special form, we are done. $\square$

Corollary 2.12. Theorem 2.4 holds.

Proof. The set $\text{poly}(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset \rightarrow G_\bullet/\Gamma)$ lies in the compact space $(G/\Gamma)^{\mathcal{F}_\emptyset}$, so it will suffice to check that it is closed.

Suppose that $\bar{f}_n \rightarrow \bar{f}$ pointwise. Then for each k , and for each parallelepiped $(\alpha_\omega)_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^k} \in \mathcal{F}_\emptyset^{[k]}$, the cube $(\bar{f}(\alpha_\omega))_\omega$ lies in the closure of $\text{HK}^k(G_\bullet/\Gamma)$. But $\text{HK}^k(G_\bullet/\Gamma)$ is already closed by Theorem 2.8, so we $\bar{f}$ maps $\mathcal{F}_\emptyset^{[k]}$ to $\text{HK}^k(G_\bullet/\Gamma)$, so we are done. $\square$

3. $\mathcal{S}_k$ -SEQUENCES

In this section, we develop some language to speak about sequences indexed by $\mathcal{S}_k$, the k -syndetic sets. The key insight here is that $c\mathcal{S}_k$ -indexed sequences admit a well behaved notion of a subsequence, which allows us to restrict to particularly structured sequences later on, through application of Propositions 3.3 and 3.3.

3.1. IP sets revisited. We briefly return to the discussion of IP sets, which serve as a motivation and an analogue for the SG_d sets. Recall that an IP set is (a superset of) a set of the form $\text{FS}(n_i) = \{n_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathcal{F}\}$ for some $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$, where $n_\alpha = \sum_{i \in \alpha} n_i$.

One of the reasons for interest in the IP sets is the celebrated theorem of Hindman [Hin74], stating that the class of IP sets is *partition regular*. Here, we say that a class of sets $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ is *partition regular* if for any $A \in \mathcal{C}$ and any finite partition $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^k A_i$ there exists some $i \in [k]$ such that $A_i \in \mathcal{C}$.

Barring spurious coincidences between different terms n_α and n_β with $\alpha \neq \beta$, the set $\text{FS}(n_i)$ can for most intents and purposes be identified with the set $\mathcal{F}$ of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$. To make this idea more precise, recall that we endow $\mathcal{F}$ with the structure of a partial semigroup, where the operation is the disjoint union. Now, the map $\alpha \mapsto n_\alpha$ is a morphism of partial semigroups, and IP sets are precisely the images of $\mathcal{F}$ by morphisms.

This point of view makes it more convenient to speak of IP subsets of a given IP set. If $(\beta_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of disjoint sets, then the map $\alpha \mapsto \beta_\alpha := \bigcup_{i \in \alpha} \beta_i$ is a morphism of partial semigroups, which is in fact an isomorphism onto the image. We will call the image of such a morphism is called an IP *ring*¹ and denote it by $\text{FU}(\beta_i)$. If f is an $\mathcal{F}$ -indexed sequence and $\text{FU}(\beta_i)$ is an IP ring, it is natural to consider the “restriction” of f to $\text{FU}(\beta_i)$, given by $\tilde{f}(\alpha) = f(\beta_\alpha)$, where as usual $\beta_\alpha = \bigcup_{i \in \alpha} \beta_i$. (Note that the definition is arranged so that the domain of $\tilde{f}$ is again $\mathcal{F}$.)

We can now reformulate Hindman’s theorem as follows. Suppose that a sequence $f: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow X$ is given, taking values in some finite set X . Hindman’s theorem then ensures that for a suitable choice of the IP ring, the corresponding subsequence $\tilde{f}$ is constant. Using the succinct terminology of Zorin-Kranich [ZK13], any finitely valued $\mathcal{F}$ -sequence is *wlog* constant.

Slightly more generally, Hindman’s theorem is equivalent to the statement that for any sequence $f: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow X$ taking values in a compact space X , there exists β_i such that the limit $\text{IP-lim}_\alpha f(\beta_\alpha)$ exists. (We do not define IP-lim_α here, but see e.g. [BFM96] for details.) While this result is never directly used, nor even properly stated, in this paper, it serves as a motivation for Proposition 3.3, which plays a key role.

¹Note that we only require β_i to be pairwise disjoint. A similar definition is sometimes made with a stronger condition $\max \beta_i < \min \beta_{i+1}$. We do not follow this approach here.

3.2. Basic definitions. We wish to adapt some of the ideas relevant to IP sets to the context of $\mathcal{SG}_k$ sets.

As suggested by the formulation of Question 1, we will be interested in polynomial sequences $\text{poly}(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset \rightarrow G_\bullet/\Gamma)$, but only values at $\mathcal{S}_k$, the k -syndetic sets, will play a role. To emphasise this state of affairs, we will use the term $\mathcal{S}_k$ -sequence to refer to a $\mathcal{F}_\emptyset$ -indexed sequence which we only intend to evaluate on $\mathcal{S}_k$. If we consider a $\mathcal{F}_\emptyset$ -indexed sequence with no $\mathcal{S}_k$ in mind, we refer to it simply as an $\mathcal{F}_\emptyset$ -sequence.

Remark 3.1. It is tempting to dispose of $\mathcal{F}_\emptyset$ altogether, and work with sequences indexed by $\mathcal{S}_k$. Indeed, $\mathcal{S}_k$ is certainly a partial semigroup, so it makes sense to consider polynomial groups such as $\text{poly}(\mathcal{S}_k \rightarrow G_\bullet)$, and much of the discussion in this section would carry through with minor modifications.

However, we pursue a different route. One of the reason is that there does not seem to be a satisfactory analogue of Proposition 2.6 for $\text{poly}(\mathcal{S}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$. Indeed, the algebraic structure of $\mathcal{S}_k$ is not strong enough to admit a good description of the polynomials from $\mathcal{S}_k$. For instance, $\mathcal{S}_k$ has no non-degenerate parallelepipeds of dimension $> k + 1$.

3.3. Subsequences. Let $f: \mathcal{F}_\emptyset \rightarrow X$ be a sequence taking values in some space X . For any IP ring $\text{FU}(\alpha_i)$ we may construct a subsequence $\tilde{f}$ given by $\tilde{f}(\beta) = f(\alpha_\beta)$.

Suppose now that α_j takes the form $\alpha_j = \{i_j, i_j + k, \dots, i_j + k - k\}$ for an increasing sequence $(i_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ with $i_{j+k} \equiv i_j \pmod{k}$. Then the map $\beta \mapsto \alpha_\beta$ maps $\mathcal{S}_k$ to $\mathcal{S}_k$. It is not difficult to see that any morphism $\mathcal{F}_\emptyset \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_\emptyset$ sending $\mathcal{S}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_k$ is essentially of this form, with the inconsequential caveat that there is some additional freedom in the choice of $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}$. For any such α_j , we will refer to $\tilde{f}(\beta) = f(\alpha_\beta)$ as a $\mathcal{S}_k$ -subsequence of f . More generally, suppose that α_i is such that the map $\beta \mapsto \alpha_\beta$ maps $\mathcal{S}_l$ to $\mathcal{S}_k$, where $l < k$. Then we refer to the $\mathcal{S}_l$ -sequence $\tilde{f}$ given by $\tilde{f}(\beta) = f(\alpha_\beta)$ as a $\mathcal{S}_l$ -subsequence of f .

It is clear that if $\tilde{f}$ is a $\mathcal{S}_l$ -subsequence of a $\mathcal{S}_k$ -sequence f then $\tilde{f}(\mathcal{S}_l) \subseteq f(\mathcal{S}_k)$. If f is a polynomial sequence (in the sense of Definition 2.1 or 2.3) then $\tilde{f}$ is again a polynomial sequence with respect to the same filtration, thanks to Proposition 2.11. Hence, in proving statements such as Theorem A and Theorem B we may freely restrict to $\mathcal{S}_k$ -subsequences.

We are also interested in an asymptotic notion of a subsequence. Here, let us assume that X is additionally a metric compact space (we could work in larger generality, but we do not need to). If f is a $\mathcal{S}_k$ -sequence, an *asymptotic $\mathcal{S}_k$ -subsequence* is by definition any pointwise limit of $\mathcal{S}_k$ -subsequences. That is, a $\mathcal{S}_k$ -sequence g is an asymptotic $\mathcal{S}_l$ -subsequence of f precisely when there exists $\mathcal{S}_l$ -subsequences $\tilde{f}_n$ of f such that for each $\beta \in \mathcal{F}_\emptyset$, $g(\beta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{f}_n(\beta)$.

Similar remarks as above apply to asymptotic subsequences. If $\tilde{f}$ is an asymptotic $\mathcal{S}_l$ -subsequence of a $\mathcal{S}_k$ -sequence f then $\tilde{f}(\mathcal{S}_l) \subseteq \text{cl}(f(\mathcal{S}_k))$. Moreover, if f is a polynomial sequence, then $\tilde{f}$ is a polynomial sequence of the same type. Indeed, it suffices to check that $\tilde{f}$ maps any parallelepiped $(\alpha_\omega)_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^m}$ (where $\alpha_\omega = \alpha_0 \cup \bigcup_{i \in \omega} \alpha_i$) into the appropriate Host-Kra cube group HK^m , which is a closed condition dependent only on a finite set of indices.

It is standard to check thus defined relation of being an (asymptotic) subsequence is transitive and reflexive. This relation is, however, not anti-symmetric, as is shown by a simple example of a pair of $\mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z}$ -valued $\mathcal{S}_k$ -sequences $f(\alpha) = \min \alpha$

$(\text{mod } k)$, $g(\alpha) = \min \alpha + 1 \pmod{k}$, which are easily seen to be $\mathcal{S}_k$ -subsequences of one another. More generally, it can be checked that f is a $\mathcal{S}_k$ -subsequence of any of its $\mathcal{S}_k$ -subsequences.

3.4. Stable sequences. We will often find ourselves in the position of working with a $\mathcal{S}_k$ -sequence taking values in a compact metric space, where we may freely restrict to asymptotic $\mathcal{S}_k$ -sequences. Hence, it is of interest to enquire into the possible simplest objects that can be obtained through such restrictions. This motivates the following definition.

Definition 3.2. Let f be a $\mathcal{S}_k$ -sequence taking values in a metric space X . Then f is said to be *stable* if for any asymptotic $\mathcal{S}_k$ -subsequence g of f , f is again an asymptotic subsequence of g .

A standard application of the Kuratowski-Zorn lemma shows that if X is compact, then any $\mathcal{S}_k$ -sequence f taking values in X has an asymptotic $\mathcal{S}_k$ -subsequence g which is stable. For example, the stable $\mathcal{S}_0$ -sequences (i.e. just the ordinary sequences) are simply the constant sequences, so for $k = 0$ we have just stated that a compact metric space is sequentially compact.

If π is a permutation of $\{1, \dots, k\}$, and f is a $\mathcal{S}_k$ -sequence, then we can form a $\mathcal{S}_k$ -subsequence $\tilde{f}_\pi$ by putting $\beta_i = \{k \lfloor \frac{i-1}{k} \rfloor + \pi(i \bmod k)\}$, and letting $\tilde{f}_\pi(\alpha) = f(\beta_\alpha)$. We will call such a subsequence a “shuffle”. In the sequel, we only use a special case of the following proposition, which deals with a more specific type of a subsequence.

Proposition 3.3 (Structure theorem for stable sequences). Let f be a stable $\mathcal{S}_k$ sequence taking values in a compact metric space X . Suppose that g is an asymptotic $\mathcal{S}_k$ -subsequence of f . Then g is a shuffle of f .

In particular, suppose that g takes the form $g(\beta) = f(\alpha_\beta)$ where $\alpha_j = \{i_j, i_j + k, \dots, i_{j+k} - k\}$ for an increasing sequence $(i_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ with $i_j \equiv j \pmod{k}$. Then $g = f$.

We will obtain the above result as a consequence of the following more precise statement. We assume familiarity with the notion of ultrafilters and the corresponding limits; for an accessible introduction we refer the reader for instance to [Ber10].

Lemma 3.4 (Ultrafilter restriction lemma). Let k be an integer. Let $p = (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k)$ be a k -tuple of non-principal ultrafilters with $n \equiv j \pmod{k}$ for p_j -almost all n . For a sequence $i = (i_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ with $i_j \equiv j \pmod{k}$, consider the intervals $\alpha_j(i)$ given by

$$\alpha_j(i) = \{i_j, i_j + k, \dots, i_{j+k} - k\},$$

and put as usual $\alpha_\beta(i) := \bigcup_{j \in \beta} \alpha_j(i)$. For a $\mathcal{S}_k$ -sequence f taking values in a compact metric space X , define the $\mathcal{S}_k$ -sequence $\tilde{f}_p$ as

$$(6) \quad \tilde{f}_p(\beta) := p_1\text{-}\lim_{i_1} p_2\text{-}\lim_{i_2} p_3\text{-}\lim_{i_3} \dots p_1\text{-}\lim_{i_{k+1}} p_2\text{-}\lim_{i_{k+2}} \dots f(\alpha_\beta(i)).$$

(Above, the limit of i_m is taken along $p_{m \bmod k}$. The limits are taken over all relevant indices i_j ; there are finitely many of those.)

Then $\tilde{f}_p$ is an asymptotic $\mathcal{S}_k$ -subsequence of f .

Proof. It will suffice to construct, for any sequence of neighbourhoods U_β of $\tilde{f}_p(\beta)$ (with $U_\beta = X$ for all but finitely many β), an increasing sequence $i = (i_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ such that $f(\alpha_\beta(i)) \in U_\beta$ for each β .

We construct i_j inductively. Unwinding the definitions of limits, for each β , we have a family of sets $A_\beta, A_\beta(i_1), A_\beta(i_1, i_2), \dots$ such that, firstly, for each l we have $A_\beta(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l) \in p_{l+1}$ and, secondly, if $i_{l+1} \in A_\beta(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l)$ for each l , then $f(\alpha_\beta(i)) \in U_\beta$.

It is clear what we need to do. Let $A(i_1, \dots, i_l) := \bigcap_\beta A_\beta(i_1, \dots, i_l)$, where the intersection is taken over β with $U_\beta \neq X$. Take any $i_1 \in A \in p_1$. Next, take $i_2 \in A(i_1) \in p_2$, $i_3 \in A(i_1, i_2) \in p_3$, and inductively $i_{l+1} \in A(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l) \in p_{l+1}$ for each l . Note that the sets $A(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l)$ are guaranteed to be non-empty as elements of an ultrafilter. $\square$

Lemma 3.4 implies Proposition 3.3. Pick a k -tuple of ultrafilters p as in Lemma 3.4. Because of stability, we may replace f with $\tilde{f}_p$, as defined above. Let g be a (non-asymptotic) $\mathcal{S}_k$ -subsequence of $\tilde{f}_p$. It will suffice to show that g is a shuffle of $\tilde{f}_p$. By definition, g takes the form $g(\gamma) = \tilde{f}_p(\beta_\gamma)$. Here, the sequence β_m takes the form $\beta_m = \{j_m, j_m + k, \dots, j_m + k - k\}$ where $(j_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of integers and $j_m \bmod k$ depends only on $m \bmod k$. Applying a shuffle, we may assume that $j_m \equiv m \pmod{k}$.

For a sequence $i = (i_k)_{k=1}^\infty$, let $\alpha_\beta(i)$ be as in the Lemma 3.4. We may now observe that

$$\alpha_{\beta_m}(i) = \bigcup_{j \in \beta_m} \{i_j, \dots, i_{j+k} - k\} = \{i_{j_m}, \dots, i_{j_m+k} - k\}.$$

Let $i'_m = i_{j_m}$ and $\alpha'_m = \{i'_m, \dots, i_{m+k} - k\}$, and let α'_γ be defined accordingly. The key point is that if we disregard inconsequential indices i_j with $j \neq j_m$, then the limit defining $g(\gamma) = \tilde{f}_p(\beta_\gamma)$ becomes identical with the limit defining $\tilde{f}_p(\gamma)$. More precisely, we may write:

$$\begin{aligned} g(\gamma) &= \tilde{f}_p(\beta_\gamma) = p_1\text{-}\lim_{i_1} p_2\text{-}\lim_{i_2} p_3\text{-}\lim_{i_3} \dots f(\alpha_{\beta_\gamma}(i)) \\ &= p_1\text{-}\lim_{i_1} p_2\text{-}\lim_{i_2} p_3\text{-}\lim_{i_3} \dots f(\alpha'_\gamma(i)) \\ &= p_1\text{-}\lim_{i'_1} p_2\text{-}\lim_{i'_2} p_3\text{-}\lim_{i'_3} \dots f(\alpha'_\gamma(i)) \\ &= p_1\text{-}\lim_{i_1} p_2\text{-}\lim_{i_2} p_3\text{-}\lim_{i_3} \dots f(\alpha_\gamma(i)) = \tilde{f}_p(\gamma). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Corollary 3.5. Let A be a SG_k set, and pick any $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $A \cap m\mathbb{N}$ is a SG_k set. Likewise, if B is a SG_k^* set, then $B \cap m\mathbb{N}$ is a SG_k^* set.

Note that similar facts for IP sets are well known.

Proof. By the definition of A being a SG_k set, there is a $\mathcal{S}_k$ -sequence n_α such that $n_\alpha \in \text{SG}_k$. Passing to a $\mathcal{S}_k$ -subsequence, we may assume without loss of generality that the sequence $(n_\alpha \bmod m)$ is stable (note that because the target space is finite, there is no need to use asymptotic subsequences). Thus, for any i we have

$$n_i \equiv n_{\{i, i+k\}} \equiv n_i + n_{i+k} \equiv 2n_i \pmod{m},$$

whence $n_i \equiv 0 \pmod{m}$, and more generally $n_\alpha \equiv 0 \pmod{m}$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_k$.

For the second statement, it suffices to check that $B \cap m\mathbb{N} \cap A \neq \emptyset$ whenever A is SG_k . But this is clear, since $m\mathbb{N} \cap A$ is SG_k and B is SG_k^* . $\square$

3.5. Stable polynomials. Among all $\mathcal{F}_\emptyset$ -sequences, we will be particularly interested in polynomial maps into the torus. Recall that an (asymptotic) subsequence of a polynomial map is again polynomial because of Proposition 2.11. Hence, we may in most cases assume that the polynomial we are working with is stable by passing to a subsequence. In this situation, we can obtain the following refinement of Proposition 2.6. For a set $\gamma \in \mathcal{F}_\emptyset$, we define the diameter $\text{diam}(\gamma) = \max \gamma - \min \gamma$. By a slight abuse of notation, we write $\gamma + k$ for the sumset $\{i + k : i \in \gamma\}$.

Proposition 3.6 (Structure of stable polynomials $\mathcal{F}_\emptyset \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^m$). Suppose that $\bar{f}: \mathcal{F}_\emptyset \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^m = \mathbb{R}^m/\mathbb{Z}^m$ is a polynomial of degree $d \leq k$, which is stable (in the sense of 3.4). Then $\bar{f}$ admits a representation of the form:

$$(7) \quad \bar{f}(\alpha) = \sum_{\gamma \subseteq \alpha} a_\gamma,$$

where $a_\gamma \in \mathbb{T}^m$ are constants, which further satisfy $a_\gamma = 0$ if $\text{diam}(\gamma) > k$ or $|\gamma| > d$, and are periodic in the sense that $a_{\gamma+k} = a_\gamma$.

Proof. It is already shown in Proposition 2.6 that $\bar{f}$ admits a representation as in (7) with $a_\gamma = 0$ if $|\gamma| > d$. At the same time, it follows from Proposition 3.3 and Lemma 3.4 that $\bar{f}$ can be represented as a limit of the form (6).

The periodicity condition $\bar{f}(\alpha) = \bar{f}(\alpha + k)$ follows immediately from the form of the limit in (6). Since the coefficients a_γ are uniquely determined by $\bar{f}$, we also have $a_\gamma = a_{\gamma+k}$.

For the vanishing of coefficients a_γ with $\text{diam}(\gamma) > k$, we proceed by induction on d , the case $d = 1$ being trivial. Note that if the claim holds for some d , then for any degree d stable polynomial f and for any α, β with $\max \alpha < \min \beta - k$ we have $f(\alpha \cup \beta) = f(\alpha) + f(\beta) - f(\emptyset)$.

To prove the claim for d , fix some $j_1 < j_2 - k$. By an inclusion-exclusion type of argument it will suffice to prove that for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_\emptyset$ with $j_1 < \min \alpha \leq \max \alpha < j_2$ we have

$$(8) \quad \sum_{\substack{\gamma \subseteq \alpha \cup \{j_1, j_2\} \\ j_1, j_2 \in \gamma}} a_\gamma = 0.$$

We first consider the case $\alpha = \emptyset$. Let $j_3 = j_2 + k$. Since $\Delta_{j_3} f$ is a polynomial of degree $d - 1$ we may write:

$$\Delta_{j_3} f(\{j_1, j_2\}) = \Delta_{j_3} f(\{j_1\}) + \Delta_{j_3} f(\{j_2\}) - \Delta_{j_3} f(\emptyset)$$

which can be rewritten in simpler terms as:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\{j_1, j_2, j_3\}) - f(\{j_1, j_2\}) &= f(\{j_1, j_3\}) - f(\{j_1\}) \\ &\quad + f(\{j_2, j_3\}) - f(\{j_2\}) - f(\{j_3\}) + f(\emptyset). \end{aligned}$$

Using stability of f combined with Proposition 3.3, we may replace each occurrence of j_2, j_3 or j_3 with j_2 . The above now simplifies to

$$f(\{j_1, j_2\}) = f(\{j_1\}) + f(\{j_2\}) - f(\emptyset).$$

Writing out f in coordinates from (6) and cancelling repeating terms, this gives the sought formula (8).

We now work with arbitrary α . The map $\Delta_\alpha f$ is a polynomial of degree $d - 1$ so by the inductive hypothesis

$$\Delta_\alpha f(\{j_1, j_2\}) = \Delta_\alpha f(\{j_1\}) + \Delta_\alpha f(\{j_2\}) - \Delta_\alpha f(\emptyset).$$

In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(\alpha \cup \{j_1, j_2\}) &= f(\alpha \cup \{j_1\}) + f(\alpha \cup \{j_2\}) \\ &\quad + f(\{j_1, j_2\}) - f(\{j_1\}) - f(\{j_2\}) - f(\alpha) + f(\emptyset). \end{aligned}$$

Using the previous step, we may simplify this to

$$f(\alpha \cup \{j_1, j_2\}) = f(\alpha \cup \{j_1\}) + f(\alpha \cup \{j_2\}) - f(\alpha),$$

which is equivalent to (8). □

4. SIMPLE RESULTS

4.1. Abelian case. We observe that with the theory developed so far, the case $d = 1$ of our main result becomes trivial. This case is already well known, but we discuss it here as a source of motivation.

Proof of Theorem 1.1, case $d = 1$. We need to check that for any linear (i.e. polynomial degree 1) $\mathcal{S}_1$ -sequence, $\bar{f}: \mathcal{F}_\emptyset \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m/\mathbb{Z}^m$ with $f(\emptyset) = 0$, there are points $\bar{f}(\alpha)$ with $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_1 \setminus \emptyset$ arbitrarily close to 0. In fact, we prove somewhat more, namely that the constant sequence 0 is an asymptotic $\mathcal{S}_1$ -subsequence of f , and hence such sets α are in rich supply.

Let $\bar{g}$ be a stable asymptotic $\mathcal{S}_1$ -subsequence of $\bar{f}$, as introduced in Section 3.4. By Corollary 3.6, we may write $\bar{g}$ in the form:

$$g(\alpha) = \sum_{i \in \alpha} a_i = |\alpha| t,$$

where $t = a_1$. Stability of $\bar{g}$ further implies:

$$t = \bar{g}(\{1\}) = \bar{g}(\{1, 2\}) = 2t,$$

and hence $t = 0$. It follows that $\bar{g}(\alpha) = 0$ for each α , as needed. □

4.2. Case $d = 2$. We now move on to the case $d = 2$, which already shows some of our main ideas.

Proof of Theorem 1.1, case $d = 2$. It will suffice to show that for any $\mathcal{S}_2$ -sequence $\bar{f} \in \text{poly}(\mathcal{F}_\emptyset \rightarrow G_\bullet/\Gamma)$ with $f(\emptyset) = e\Gamma$, where $G_\bullet/\Gamma$ is a 2-step nilmanifold, there are $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_2$ such that $\bar{f}(\alpha)$ is arbitrarily close to $e\Gamma$.

Step 1 (Model problem). Let $f: \mathcal{F}_\emptyset \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^m$ be a polynomial of degree 2 with $f(\emptyset) = 0$. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_2$ such that $\|f(\alpha)\| < \varepsilon$.

Proof. The form of the claim is such that we can freely restrict f to an asymptotic $\mathcal{S}_2$ -subsequence. Hence, we may without loss of generality assume that f is stable in the sense of Section 3.4. Hence, by Corollary 3.6, f takes the form:

$$f(\alpha) = \sum_{\gamma \subseteq \alpha} a_\gamma,$$

where $a_\gamma \in \mathbb{T}$ are constants, which further satisfy $a_\gamma = 0$ if $\text{diam}(\gamma) > 2$ or $|\gamma| > 2$, and a_γ are periodic in the sense that $a_{\gamma+2} = a_\gamma$.

Taking into account the above properties of a_γ , there are only 6 meaningful coefficients, namely $a_1, a_2, a_{12}, a_{23}, a_{13}, a_{24}$. (We omit the curly brackets to avoid obfuscating notation; hence e.g. $a_{13} \equiv a_{\{1,3\}}$.)

We record some of the relations among the α_γ , which easily follow from stability:

$$(9) \quad a_{13} = -a_1, \quad a_{24} = -a_2, \quad a_{12} + a_{23} = 0.$$

Our general strategy at this point is to start with a sufficiently *generic* set $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_2$, and check that it can be perturbed to a set α' such that $f(\alpha) \simeq 0$. A set α will be highly generic if it contains any possible *pattern* a large number of times.

To make these ideas precise, let us say that a pattern of length M is a set $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_2$ such that $\pi \subseteq [M] = \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$. We will say that π *appears in α at position n* if $n \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ and $(\alpha - n) \cap [M] = \pi$. (Note that this condition depends not only on α and π but also on M .) Every pattern will appear in *some* $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_2$ (e.g. $\alpha = \pi$), but there are some patterns which appear only boundedly many times. For instance, length 3 the pattern $\pi = \{1\}$ can appear only once in any $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_2$, since if π appears at position n , then $n+1 = \max \alpha$. Thus, we say that α is (M, N) -generic if for any pattern π one of the following is true: either π appears at most $C = C(\pi)$ times in *any* $\beta \in \mathcal{S}_2$, or π appears at least N times in α .

It is a simple but useful fact that for any M, N there exist $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_2$ which are (M, N) -generic. We will discuss a related issue in more detail in Section 6. Note also that if $\alpha, \alpha' \in \mathcal{S}_2$ are close in the sense that $|\alpha \Delta \alpha'| \leq L$ for some integer L , then if α is (M, N) -generic, then also α' is (M, N') -generic, where $N' = N - C(L, M)$ for some constant C independent of N . We are interested in the regime where $N \rightarrow \infty$, but M takes a fairly small value. In fact, it will suffice to take $M = 5$.

The class of generic sets is slightly too large for our purposes, for somewhat mundane reasons. We will call a set α *well-formed* if additionally $\max \alpha \equiv \min \alpha \pmod{2}$, and work mostly with well-formed α .

Informally, we would like to consider the set of all possible values of $f(\alpha)$ for all highly generic and well-formed α . Hence, we define Σ to be the set of those $s \in \mathbb{T}$ such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and any N there exists $(5, N)$ -generic, well-formed α such that $\|f(\alpha) - s\| < \varepsilon$. Secondly, we want to take Δ to be the set of the perturbations of $f(\alpha)$ which are always feasible if α is sufficiently generic. Precisely, we declare $t \in \Delta_0$ if and only if there exists constants $L = L(t)$ and N_0 such that for all $N \geq N_0$ and all N -generic, well-formed α , we can find well-formed α' with $|\alpha \Delta \alpha'| \leq L$ and $f(\alpha') = f(\alpha) + t$. Finally, put $\Delta := \text{cl}(\Delta_0)$. We note some simple properties of Σ and Δ .

Firstly, we have $\Sigma + \Delta = \Sigma$ and $\Delta + \Delta = \Delta$. To prove the first equality, it will suffice to prove the inclusion $\Sigma + \Delta_0 \subseteq \Sigma$. Take $s \in \Sigma$ and $t \in \Delta_0$. For any N, ε we may select $(5, N)$ -generic, well-formed α such that $\|f(\alpha) - s\| < \varepsilon$. We may (assuming that N is large enough) find α' with $|\alpha \Delta \alpha'| < L$ for a constant L dependent only on t such that $f(\alpha') = f(\alpha) + t$. Hence, $\|f(\alpha') - (s + t)\| < \varepsilon$, and α' is N' generic, where $N' = N - C(L) \rightarrow \infty$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. This finishes the proof of the first inclusion; the second inclusion is similarly simple and is left as an exercise to the reader.

Secondly, we notice that Δ is a group. Closure under sums has already been discussed, so it remains to check that $\Delta = -\Delta$. Take $t \in \Delta$. There exists a sequence $n_j t \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Hence $(n_j - 1)t \rightarrow -t \in \Delta$, as needed.

Thirdly, we exhibit generating sets for Σ and Δ . For any well-formed α , it is not difficult to check that $f(\alpha) \in \mathbb{Z}a_1 + \mathbb{Z}a_2$. Indeed, the analogous statement involving a_γ for all $\gamma \in \{1, 2, 12, 23, 13, 24\}$ would obviously be true; we may eliminate a_{13} and a_{24} using (9), and we may notice that the expression for $f(\alpha)$ contains the same number of occurrences of a_{12} and a_{23} , so these can also be eliminated using

(9) (this is the only point where we use the fact that α is well-formed). Hence, $\Sigma \subseteq \text{cl}(\mathbb{Z}a_1 + \mathbb{Z}a_2)$.

We next consider Δ . If α is $(5, N)$ -generic and N is sufficiently large, then we may find an occurrence of the length 5 pattern $\{2, 4\}$. We may form α' by replacing this pattern with $\{2, 3, 4\}$ (i.e. put $\alpha' := \alpha \cup \{n + 3\}$, where n is the position where the original pattern appears in α). An easy calculation shows that $f(\alpha') - f(\alpha) = a_{12} + a_{23} + a_1 = a_1$. Hence $a_1 \in \Delta$. By a symmetric argument, $a_0 \in \Delta$. Thus, $\Delta \supseteq \text{cl}(\mathbb{Z}a_0 + \mathbb{Z}a_1)$.

Combining the two inclusions, we conclude that $\Sigma = \Delta = \text{cl}(\mathbb{Z}a_0 + \mathbb{Z}a_1)$. This finishes the argument: since $0 \in \Sigma$, we may find some $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_2$ (which incidentally is highly-generic and well-formed) such that $\|f(\alpha)\| < \varepsilon$, where ε is as small as we please. $\square$

We remark that our proof in fact produces a $\mathcal{S}_0$ -subsequence which is identically 0, rather than a single set. Note, however, that we are unable to get a $\mathcal{S}_1$ -subsequence.

Step 2 (Reduction to model setting). Let $\bar{f} \in \text{poly}(\mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow G_\bullet/\Gamma)$ be a polynomial $\mathcal{S}_2$ -sequence with $f(\emptyset) = e\Gamma$, where $G_\bullet/\Gamma$ is a 2-step nilmanifold. Define the nilmanifold $\tilde{G}_\bullet/\tilde{\Gamma}$ by $\tilde{G}_0 = \tilde{G}_1 = \tilde{G}_2 = G_2$, $\tilde{G}_3 = \tilde{G}_4 = \dots = \{e_G\}$, $\tilde{\Gamma} = \Gamma \cap G_2$.

Then, $\tilde{G}_\bullet/\tilde{\Gamma}$ is a 2-step nilmanifold, and there exists a polynomial sequence $\bar{g} \in \text{poly}(\mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow \tilde{G}_\bullet/\tilde{\Gamma})$ such that $\iota \circ \bar{g}$ is a $\mathcal{S}_2$ -asymptotic subsequence of $\bar{f}$, where $\iota: \tilde{G}/\tilde{\Gamma} \rightarrow G/\Gamma$ is the natural inclusion $g\tilde{\Gamma} \mapsto g\Gamma$.

Proof. It is clear that $\tilde{G}_\bullet$ is a filtration, and that $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is discrete. Each quotient $\tilde{G}/\tilde{\Gamma} \cap \tilde{G}_j$ is the same as $G/\Gamma \cap G_j$ for some i , so $\tilde{G}_\bullet$ is evidently $\tilde{\Gamma}$ -rational. The content of this step is that $\bar{f}$ has an asymptotic subsequence which takes values in $G_2\Gamma$. (See Lemma 5.2 for details.)

Let $\tilde{f}$ be a stable asymptotic $\mathcal{S}_2$ -subsequence $\bar{f}$. We claim that indeed $\tilde{f}(\alpha) \in G_2\Gamma$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_0$. Because G_2 is normal, there is a well-defined projection map $\pi: G/\Gamma \rightarrow G/G_2\Gamma$ given by $g\Gamma \mapsto g\Gamma G_2$. The map $\bar{h} = \pi \circ \tilde{f}$ is easily verified to be a degree 1 polynomial with $\bar{h}(\emptyset) = e\Gamma G_2$, taking values in the torus $G/\Gamma G_2$. Moreover, $\bar{h}$ is stable because $\tilde{f}$ is stable. Repeating the argument from the case $d = 1$, we find that $\bar{h}(\alpha) = e\Gamma G_2$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_0$. Thus, $\tilde{f}$ takes values in ΓG_2 . $\square$

Combining the two steps easily finishes the proof. Start with a $\mathcal{S}_2$ -sequence $\bar{f} \in \text{poly}(\mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow G_\bullet/\Gamma)$ with $\bar{f}(\emptyset) = e\Gamma$, where $G_\bullet/\Gamma$ is a 2-step nilmanifold. Let $\bar{g}$ be the asymptotic $\mathcal{S}_2$ -subsequence from Step 2. Using Step 1, we find that $e\tilde{\Gamma} \in \text{cl}\{\bar{g}(\alpha) : \alpha \in \mathcal{S}_2\}$, whence $e\Gamma \in \text{cl}\{\bar{f}(\alpha) : \alpha \in \mathcal{S}_2\}$. $\square$

5. MAIN RESULTS

5.1. Robust version and induction. We now approach the proof of Theorem B for general $d \geq 1$. To begin with, we state a more robust version, which is better suited for an inductive proof.

Theorem 5.1 (B, strong version). *Let $G_\bullet/\Gamma$ be a nilmanifold of length d , and let $\bar{f} \in \text{poly}(\mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow G_\bullet/\Gamma)$ with $f(\emptyset) = e\Gamma$. Let $0 \leq k \leq \binom{d+1}{2}$ be an integer, and*

put $l = k - \binom{d+1}{2}$. Then, there exists a asymptotic S_l -subsequence of $\bar{f}$ which is constantly equal to $e\Gamma$.

Note that the strong version of Theorem B, 2.5, follows directly from the above statement by putting $k = \binom{d+1}{2}$.

We will prove the above robust version of our main theorem by induction on the complexity of $G_\bullet/\Gamma$. The following lemma gives a useful description of polynomial sequences taking values on subnilmanifolds. We will often use this identification implicitly.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $G_\bullet/\Gamma$ be a nilmanifold of length d , and let $r \leq d$. Let the filtration $\tilde{G}_\bullet$ given by $\tilde{G}_i = G_r$ for $i \leq r$ and $\tilde{G}_i = G_i$ for $i \geq r$, and let $\tilde{\Gamma} := G_r \cap \Gamma$. Then, there is a natural bijective correspondence between maps $\bar{f} \in \text{poly}(\mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow G_\bullet/\Gamma)$ taking values in $G_r\Gamma = \{g\Gamma : g \in G_r\} \subseteq G/\Gamma$ on one side and polynomial maps $\bar{h} \in \text{poly}(\mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow \tilde{G}_\bullet/\tilde{\Gamma})$ on the other side. More precisely, $\bar{h}$ corresponds to $\bar{f} = \iota \circ \bar{h}$, where $\iota: G_r/(G_r \cap \Gamma) \rightarrow G/\Gamma$ is the natural inclusion given by $g(G_r \cap \Gamma) \mapsto g\Gamma$.*

Proof. Given $\bar{h} \in \text{poly}(\mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow \tilde{G}_\bullet/\tilde{\Gamma})$, we may lift it to $h \in \text{poly}(\mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow \tilde{G}_\bullet)$ so that $\bar{h}(\alpha) = h(\alpha)\tilde{\Gamma}$. Since $\tilde{G}_0 = G_r \subseteq G_0$, there is a natural way to consider h as a map to G_0 , and indeed $h \in \text{poly}(\mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow G_\bullet)$. Thus, we may take $\bar{f} \in \text{poly}(\mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow G_\bullet/\Gamma)$ given by $\bar{f}(\alpha) := h(\alpha)\Gamma$. It is clear that $\bar{f}$ takes values in $G_r\Gamma$, and $\bar{f} = \iota \circ \bar{h}$.

For the other direction, assume that $\bar{f} \in \text{poly}(\mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow G_\bullet/\Gamma)$ taking values in $G_r\Gamma$ is given. For each $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}_0$, there is unique $\bar{h}(\alpha)$ such that $\iota(\bar{h}(\alpha)) = \bar{f}(\alpha)$: one can take arbitrary $g_r \in G_r$ such that $\bar{f}(\alpha) = g_r\Gamma$ and put $\bar{h}(\alpha) = g_r(G_r \cap \Gamma)$; it is easy to see that g_r is unique up to multiplication by an element of $G \cap \Gamma$. Hence, we have a map $\bar{h}: \mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow G_r/(G_r \cap \Gamma)$, and it remains to check that $\bar{h}$ is a polynomial.

Take any parallelepiped $(\alpha_\omega)_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^k} \in \mathcal{F}_0^{[k]}$ and consider the cubes $\bar{\mathbf{h}} = (\bar{h}(\alpha_\omega))_\omega$ and $\bar{\mathbf{g}} = (\bar{f}(\alpha_\omega))_\omega \in \text{HK}^k(G_\bullet/\Gamma)$. We claim that $\bar{\mathbf{g}}$ can be lifted to a cube $\mathbf{g} = (g_\omega) \in \text{HK}^k(G_\bullet)$ so that $g_\omega \in G_r$ for all ω . Once this is accomplished, we can construe $\mathbf{g}$ as an element of $\text{HK}^k(\tilde{G}_\bullet)$, so that $\bar{\mathbf{h}}$ is the projection of $\mathbf{g}$, and in particular $\bar{\mathbf{h}} \in \text{HK}^k(\tilde{G}_\bullet/\tilde{\Gamma})$.

Begin with any lift $\mathbf{g}$, and recall that $\mathbf{g}$ can be written as

$$\mathbf{g} = \prod_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^k} \tilde{g}_\omega^{[\omega]} = \tilde{g}_{\omega_1}^{[\omega_1]} \tilde{g}_{\omega_2}^{[\omega_2]} \dots \tilde{g}_{\omega_{2^k}}^{[\omega_{2^k}]},$$

where the product is taken in some fixed order compatible with the order induced by inclusion. Note that we are still free to modify $\mathbf{g}$ by any element of $\text{HK}^k(G_\bullet) \cap \Gamma^{\{0,1\}^k}$. We will inductively alter g_ω so that $\tilde{g}_\omega \in G_r$, where we consider ω in the order of increasing size $|\omega|$. Without loss of generality, it will suffice to deal with the final step; that is we assume that $\tilde{g}_\omega \in G_r$ for all $\omega \neq 1^k$.

To begin with, we notice that:

$$g_{1^k} = \left(\prod_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^k_*} \tilde{g}_\omega^{[\omega]} \right) \tilde{g}_{1^k}, \text{ whence } \tilde{g}_{1^k} \in G_r\Gamma \cap G_k.$$

Write $\tilde{g}_{1^k} = g_r\gamma = g_k$. If $r > k$ then $\gamma \in G_k \cap \Gamma$. Else, if $r \leq k$ then $\gamma \in G_r$. In either case, $\tilde{g}_{1^k} \in G_r(G_k \cap \Gamma)$. Multiplying $\mathbf{g}$ by the inverse of $\gamma^{[1^k]} \in \text{HK}^k(G_\bullet) \cap \Gamma^{\{0,1\}^k}$ (as we may), we ensure that $\tilde{g}_{1^k} \in G_r$, as claimed. $\square$

Proposition 5.3. Let $\bar{f} \in \text{poly}(\mathcal{F} \rightarrow G_\bullet/\Gamma)$, where $G_\bullet/\Gamma$ is a nilmanifold of length d , and let $k \geq 0$ be an integer. Let r be the first index such that $G_r \subsetneq G_0$. Put $l = k - r$, and suppose that $l \geq 0$.

Then, there exists an asymptotic $\mathcal{S}_l$ -subsequence $\bar{g}$ of $\bar{f}$ such that g takes values in $G_r\Gamma \simeq G_r/(G_r \cap \Gamma)$.

Proof of Theorem 5.1, assuming Proposition 5.3. Take $\bar{f} \in \text{poly}(\mathcal{F} \rightarrow G_\bullet/\Gamma)$ as in Theorem 5.1. By repeated application of Proposition 5.3, we construct asymptotic $\mathcal{S}_{l_n}$ -subsequences $\bar{f}^{(n)}$, where (up to the identification discussed in Lemma 5.2) $\bar{f}^{(n)} \in \text{poly}(\mathcal{F} \rightarrow G_\bullet^{(n)}/\Gamma^{(n)})$, where $l_n = k - \sum_{j=d-n+1}^d j$. The filtration $G_\bullet^{(n)}$ takes the form $G_0^{(n)} = G_1^{(n)} = \dots = G_{r_n}^{(n)} = G_{r_n}$ and $G_i = G_i$ for $i > r_n$, where r_n is a strictly increasing sequence with $r_1 \geq 2$. Finally $\Gamma^{(n)} = \Gamma \cap G_0^{(n)}$.

We are specifically interested in $n = d$. The filtration $G^{(d)}$ is trivial, because $G_0^{(d)} = G_{r_d} \subseteq G_{d+1} = \{e_G\}$. Hence, the sequence $\bar{f}^{(n)}$ is constantly equal to $e\Gamma$, and is an asymptotic $\mathcal{S}_{l_d}$ -subsequence of $\bar{f}$, where $l_d = k - \binom{d+1}{2}$. $\square$

5.2. Reduction to an abelian problem. We deduce Proposition 5.3 from a model problem in the abelian setting. The proof of the following proposition is the most technical element of this paper, and occupies most of Section 6.

Proposition 5.4. Let k, d be integers with $d \leq k + 1$, and put $l = k - d - 1 \geq 0$. Let $f: \mathcal{S}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^m$ be a polynomial map of degree d into a torus.

Then, there exists an asymptotic $\mathcal{S}_l$ -subsequence of f which is constantly equal to 0.

Remark 5.5. Any finite abelian group A can be embedded in a torus, so the above proposition applies equally to $f: \mathcal{S}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^m \times A$.

Proof of Proposition 5.3 assuming Proposition 5.4. Let $\bar{f} \in \text{poly}(\mathcal{F} \rightarrow G_\bullet/\Gamma)$ as in Proposition 5.3. It will suffice to find a $\mathcal{S}_l$ -asymptotic subsequence $\bar{g}$ of $\bar{f}$ which takes values in $G_r\Gamma$.

We have a natural projection map $\pi: G/\Gamma \rightarrow G/\Gamma G_r$, given by $g\Gamma \mapsto g\Gamma G_r$. Since $[G_{r-1}, G_{r-1}] \subseteq G_r$, the quotient $G/\Gamma G_r = (G_{r-1}/G_r)/(\Gamma G_r/G_r)$ is either a torus, or the product of a torus and a finite abelian group. Note that $\pi \circ \bar{f}$ is a polynomial of degree at most $r - 1$, taking values in $G/\Gamma G_r$. Hence, we may apply Proposition 5.4, to extract a $\mathcal{S}_{k-r}$ -subsequence $\bar{g}$ of $\bar{f}$ so that $\pi \circ \bar{g}$ is identically 0. This precisely means that $\bar{g}$ takes values in ΓG_r , so we are done. $\square$

5.3. A counterexample. It is not clear if Theorem 5.1 is sharp, in the sense that it is no longer true for a larger value of l . Indeed, if the answer to Question 1 is positive, one would expect the theorem to hold with $l = k - d$.

Here, we give an example showing that the bounds in Proposition 5.4 and in Theorem A are essentially sharp. Hence, an inductive scheme such as the one employed in the proof of Theorem 5.1 is doomed to give only $l = k - \Omega(d^2)$.

Example 5.6. Fix integers $d \leq k$. We construct a degree d polynomial $f \in \text{poly}(\mathcal{S}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{T})$ such that if $l \geq k - d + 2$ then the constant sequence 0 is *not* an

asymptotic $\mathcal{S}_l$ -subsequence of f . Let f be given by

$$f(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{\emptyset \neq \gamma \subseteq \alpha \\ \text{diam}(\gamma) \leq k \\ |\gamma| \leq d}} (-1)^{|\gamma|} \pmod{1}.$$

(There is nothing particularly special about the constant $\frac{1}{2}$, but it is a convenient choice.) Ostensibly, f is a polynomial of degree d . Suppose now that $\text{FU}(\alpha_i)$ is an IP ring such $\beta \mapsto \alpha_\beta$ maps $\mathcal{S}_l$ sets to $\mathcal{S}_k$ sets, where l is such as above. We will show that $f(\alpha_\beta)$ is far from 0 for some $\beta \in \mathcal{S}_l$. Indeed, we will show that $f(\alpha_i) = \frac{1}{2}$ for sufficiently large i , say $i \geq l$.

Consider any $\gamma \subseteq \alpha_i$ with $\text{diam}(\gamma) \leq k$. We will show these properties already imply that $|\gamma| \leq d$. Let $n = \min \gamma$ so that $\gamma \subseteq [n, n+k]$. For any $i < j < i+l$, the set $\alpha_j \cup \alpha_{j-l}$ needs to intersect $[n, n+k]$, else $\alpha_j \cup \alpha_{j-l}$ would fail to be k -syndetic. Thus, $|\gamma| + (l-1) \leq k+1$ and $|\gamma| \leq k-l+2 \leq d$. It follows that:

$$f(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{\gamma \subseteq \alpha \\ \text{diam}(\gamma) \leq k}} (-1)^{|\gamma|} = \frac{1}{2} \pmod{1},$$

where the last equality is the inclusion-exclusion principle.

5.4. Reduction to the connected case. In this section we argue that in definition of $\text{Nil}_d\text{-Bohr}_0$ sets in Section 1.2, we may without loss of generality assume that the space G/Γ is indeed compact. The argument is inspired by the discussion in [Lei05].

This reduction is not, strictly speaking, used at any point in this paper. However, many papers deal specifically with polynomial maps to quotients of simply connected (and connected) nilpotent Lie group. Hence, it is useful to bear in mind that we could restrict to this more specific situation.

Lemma 5.7. *Let B be the $\text{Nil}_d\text{-Bohr}_0$ set $\{n \in \mathbb{N} : g^n \Gamma \in U\Gamma\}$ for some nilmanifold G/Γ , $g \in G$, $e \in U \subseteq G$.*

Then, there exists another nilmanifold H/Λ with H simply connected, a polynomial sequence $h: \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow H$ with respect to some filtration of length $\leq d$, with $h(0) = e$, and open neighbourhood $e \subseteq V \subseteq H$ such that B is a superset of

$$(10) \quad \{n \in \mathbb{N} : h(n)\Lambda \in V\Lambda\}.$$

Proof. Let G° denote the connected component of identity in G . Because G/Γ is compact, $G^\circ\Gamma$ has a finite index in G ; say $G = \bigcup_{i=1}^r a_i G^\circ\Gamma$. (We may assume $a_i \in \Gamma$.) Replacing G with the group generated by $G^\circ \cup \{a_i : i \in [r]\}$ if necessary, we may assume that G/G° is finitely generated.

For some m , we have $g^m \in G^\circ\Gamma$. Put $g^m = h_1\gamma$ with $h_1 \in G^\circ$, $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Using the Hall–Petresco formula, we find that

$$g^{mn}\Gamma = h_1^n h_2^{\binom{n}{2}} \dots h_d^{\binom{n}{d}} \Gamma =: h(n)\Gamma,$$

where $h_i \in G_i^\circ := (G_i)^\circ$. One can check that $h(n)$ is a polynomial sequence of $G^\circ/\Gamma \cap G^\circ$, with respect to the filtration G_i° . Thus, the set $B/m := \{\frac{b}{m} : b \in B\} \cap \mathbb{N}$ contains a set of the form (10), with $H = G^\circ$ connected (but not necessarily simply connected).

For any connected H , we can find the universal cover $\tilde{H} \rightarrow H$ by a simply connected nilpotent Lie group $\tilde{H}$. The lattice Λ lifts to a lattice in $\tilde{\Lambda}$, and polynomial sequences lift to polynomial sequences. Hence in (10) we may freely assume simple-connectivity.

It remains to show that if a set C is of the form (10) with H simply-connected, then so is $m \cdot C$. Using Lie algebra of H , we may write $h(n) = h'(n)^m$ for a polynomial sequence h' . Replacing H with $H \times \mathbb{R}$ and Λ with $\Lambda \times \mathbb{Z}$, we may now represent $m \cdot C$ as

$$(11) \quad \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : h'(n)^n \Lambda \in V\Lambda, \frac{n}{m} \in \left(-\frac{1}{2m}, \frac{1}{2m} \right) + \mathbb{Z} \right\}. \quad \square$$

6. MODEL PROBLEM

In this section we prove Proposition 5.4. Together with previous considerations, this will finish the proof of our main result, Theorem B. Towards the end, we also explain how to adapt the argument to prove Theorem A.

Let $f: \mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ be a degree d polynomial viewed as a $\mathcal{S}_k$ -subsequence, as in Proposition 5.4. Suppose further that $k \geq d + 1$ and let $l = k - d - 1$. Passing to an asymptotic $\mathcal{S}_k$ -subsequence if necessary, we may assume that f is stable. Recall that by Corollary 3.6, f takes the form

$$(12) \quad f(\beta) = \sum_{\gamma \subseteq \beta} a_\gamma,$$

$$(13) \quad a_\gamma = 0 \text{ if } |\gamma| \geq d \text{ or } \text{diam } \gamma > k.$$

Our main idea, much as in the case $d = 2$ discussed in Section 4, is to begin with a suitably generic IP ring $\text{FU}(\alpha_i)$ such that $\beta \mapsto a_\beta$ maps $\mathcal{S}_l$ to $\mathcal{S}_k$, and to perturb α_i slightly to ensure that $f(\alpha_\beta)$ is small for all $\beta \in \mathcal{F}_0$. Throughout, (α_i) denotes a sequence of disjoint $\mathcal{S}_k$ sets.

6.1. Patterns. We define a *pattern of length M* to be a collection of disjoint sets $\pi = (\pi_i)_{i=1}^M$ which are either in $\mathcal{S}_k$ or empty, such that $\beta \mapsto \pi_\beta$ maps $\mathcal{S}_l$ sets to $\mathcal{S}_k$, provided that π_i are all non-empty for $i \in \beta$. We say that (π_i) *occurs* at position $n \equiv 0 \pmod{k}$ in (α_i) if for each i , we have $(\alpha_i - n) \cap [M] = \pi_i$. (Note that this definition depends on M as well as on α_i and π_i).

We say that (α_i) is *well-formed* if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1) for each i , $\min \alpha_i \equiv \max \alpha_i \pmod{k}$,
- (2) for each i , $\min \alpha_{i+l+1} > \max \alpha_i + k$,
- (3) $\beta \mapsto \alpha_\beta$ maps $\mathcal{S}_l$ to $\mathcal{S}_k$.

(Note that we are working with fixed k, l and this definition is specific to those values.)

We say that (α_i) is (M, N) -generic if for any pattern π of length at most M , one of the following holds:

- (1) there is a constant $C = C(\pi)$ such that (π_i) occurs at most C times in any well-formed sequence (β_i) ,
- (2) the pattern π occurs at least N times in (α_i) .

We apply this definition in the regime where M is fixed and $N \rightarrow \infty$. In fact, it is enough to take $M = 3k$. The following observation shows that the above definition is not vacuous.

Claim 1. For any (M, N) , there exists a well-formed sequence of sets (α_i) which is (M, N) -generic.

Proof. We need to construct (α_i) such that each pattern (π_i) of bounded length, which may potentially occur numerous times in some well-formed (β_i) , occurs many times in (α_i) . Our strategy is to begin with a class of patterns whose numerous occurrences may be easily guaranteed, and then gradually extending this class. The construction is (implicitly) inductive, but we reuse the same symbol (α_i) at each step.

Taking α_i to be long arithmetic progressions with step k , is easy to ensure that (α_i) has many occurrences of any pattern of the form

$$(14) \quad \pi_i = \begin{cases} \{(i \bmod k), (i \bmod k) + k, \dots, (i \bmod k) + mk\}, & \text{if } j \leq i \leq i + l' \\ \emptyset, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $l' = l$ or $l' = l - 1$, and m is bounded. It is not difficult to alter (α_i) so as to change any occurrence of the pattern (14) into a pattern of the similar form

$$(15) \quad \pi_i = \begin{cases} \{a_i, a_i + k, a_i + 2k, \dots, a_i + m'k\}, & \text{if } j \leq i \leq i + l' \\ \emptyset, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $1 \leq a_i \leq k$ are arbitrary and $m' = m - O(1)$. Hence, we may assume that (α_i) contains many occurrences of patterns (15). Applying similar reasoning, we may also convert occurrences of (15) into patterns

$$(16) \quad \pi_i = \begin{cases} \{a_i, a_i + k, a_i + 2k, \dots, a_i + t_i k, b_i + t_i k, \dots, b_i + m''k\}, & \text{if } j \leq i \leq i + l' \\ \emptyset, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $1 \leq b_i \leq k$ are arbitrary and $m'' = m' - O(1)$ (but we claim no control over the t_i).

Finally, take any pattern (π_i) which occurs numerous times in some well-formed (β_i) . There is some index j such that if $\pi_i \neq \emptyset$ then $j \leq i \leq j + l$. We may further assume that $\pi_i \neq \emptyset$ precisely for $j \leq i \leq j + l'$, where $l' = l$ or $l' = l - 1$. Letting $a_i = \min \pi_i \bmod k$ and $b_i = \max \pi_i \bmod k$, we see that any occurrence of the pattern (16) may be converted into an occurrence of the sought pattern π , supposing (as we may) that m'' is sufficiently large with respect to π . $\square$

6.2. Perturbations. Fix an arbitrary metric on $\mathbb{T}^{\mathcal{F}_0}$ which is compatible with the product structure. We define Σ to be the set of those $s \in \mathbb{T}^{\mathcal{F}_0}$ such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and any N there exists $(3k, N)$ -generic, well-formed (α_i) such that $\|f(\alpha_\xi) - s_\xi\| < \varepsilon$ (where ξ stands for a dummy variable²).

We further define the set of possible ‘‘perturbations’’ $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{T}^{\mathcal{F}_0}$. For $t = (t_\xi)_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_0}$, we declare $t \in \Delta_0$ if and only if there exists constants L and N_0 such that for all $N \geq N_0$, all $(3k, N)$ -generic, well-formed $(\alpha_i)_i$, we can find well-formed $(\alpha'_i)_i$ with $\sum_{i=1}^\infty |\alpha_i \Delta \alpha'_i| \leq L$ and $f(\alpha'_\xi) = f(\alpha_\xi) + t_\xi$. Finally, put $\Delta := \text{cl}(\Delta_0)$.

Because of (12), any $(s_\xi) \in \Sigma$ admits a representation $s_\xi = \sum_{\gamma \subseteq \xi} c_\gamma$ for some constants c_γ . More precisely, if $s_\xi = f(\alpha_\xi)$, then c_γ are given by $c_\gamma = \sum_{\delta} a_\delta$, where the sum runs over δ with $\delta \subseteq \alpha_\gamma$ but $\delta \not\subseteq \alpha_{\gamma'}$ for $\gamma' \subsetneq \gamma$. Stability of f implies that

²Hence, strictly speaking we mean $\|(f(\alpha_\xi) - s_\xi)_{\xi \in \mathcal{F}_0}\| < \varepsilon$.

$c_\gamma = 0$ if $|\gamma| > d$ or $\text{diam}(\gamma) > k$. Likewise, any $t \in \Delta$ admits a representation of the same form $t_\xi = \sum_{\gamma \subseteq \xi} b_\gamma$, where $b_\gamma = 0$ if $|\gamma| > d$ or $\text{diam}(\gamma) > k$. Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{T}^{\mathcal{F}_0}$ be the set of all $(c_\gamma)_\gamma$ as above, and let B accordingly be the set of all $(b_\gamma)_\gamma$.

The sets Σ and A are rather closely connected. Indeed, the map $\mathbb{T}^{\mathcal{F}_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^{\mathcal{F}_0}$ given by $\{\xi \mapsto c_\xi\} \mapsto \{\xi \mapsto \sum_{\gamma \subseteq \xi} c_\gamma\}$ is a bijection (as verified by an inclusion-exclusion argument) and an isomorphism of groups. Same applies to Δ and B .

We make some simple observations concerning the sets just defined. Just as before, we have $\Delta + \Sigma = \Sigma$ and $\Delta + \Delta = \Delta$, and moreover Δ is a closed group. The argument is essentially the same as in Section 4.2. For the same reasons, we have that $A + B = A$ and B is a closed group. We now study Δ and Σ in more detail.

Claim 2. For any $\kappa, \gamma \in \mathcal{F}_0$ with $d \geq |\gamma| \geq |\kappa|$ and $\text{diam}(\kappa) \leq l$, $\text{diam}(\gamma) \leq k$, there exists $t = (t_\xi)_\xi \in \Delta$ such that

- (1) $t_\beta = 0$ unless $\beta \supseteq \kappa$,
- (2) $t_\kappa \in a_\gamma + \sum_{\delta \supsetneq \gamma} \mathbb{Z} a_\delta$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\gamma \subseteq [k, 2k]$. We begin by choosing a pattern $\pi = (\pi_j)$ of length $3k$ such that

- (1) $\pi_j \neq \emptyset$ for $j \in \kappa$,
- (2) $\bigcup_{j=1}^\infty \pi_j \cap \gamma = \emptyset$,
- (3) (π_j) occurs in all $(3k, N)$ -generic (α_i) for sufficiently large N

Such π can be constructed greedily, assigning each $m \in [3k] \setminus \gamma$ to consecutive sets π_j , $j = \min \kappa, \dots, \min \kappa + l$. (It is at this point that we are using that $l + d + 1 \leq k$.)

Since $|\gamma| \geq |\kappa|$, we may partition $\gamma = \bigcup_{j \in \kappa} \gamma_j$ into $|\kappa|$ non-empty sets. Let $\gamma_j = \emptyset$ for $j \notin \kappa$. Fix one such partition once and for all.

Suppose that (α_i) is a well-formed, $(3k, N)$ -generic sequence of sets, for some large N . Pick, arbitrarily, some n such that (π_j) appears at position n . For any $\sigma \subseteq \gamma$, we may consider the distortion of (α_i) given by $\alpha_i^\sigma = \alpha_i \cup (\gamma_i \cap \sigma + n)$. Note that the union is disjoint, and we have:

$$(\alpha_i^\sigma - n) \cap [3k] = \pi_i \cup (\gamma_i \cap \sigma).$$

Clearly, thus obtained α_i^σ differs from α_i only in boundedly many places. Hence, the difference $\left(f(\alpha_i^\sigma) - f(\alpha_i)\right)_\xi$ belongs to Δ . Note that this difference depends only on π and σ , but not on α (this is the reason why we work with patterns of length $3k$ rather than k). More generally, summing over all σ (with appropriate choice of signs) we find:

$$t = (t_\xi)_\xi \in \Delta, \quad t_\xi = \sum_{\sigma \subseteq \gamma} (-1)^{|\sigma|} f(\alpha_\xi^\sigma).$$

We now study the coefficients t_β for different sets β . (Only $\beta \subseteq \kappa$ will play an important role.) We have

$$t_\beta = \sum_{\sigma \subseteq \gamma} (-1)^{|\sigma|} f(\alpha_\beta^\sigma) = \sum_{\sigma \subseteq \gamma} (-1)^{|\sigma|} \sum_{\delta \subseteq \alpha_\beta^\sigma} a_\delta = \sum_{\delta \subseteq \alpha_\beta^\gamma} a_\delta \sum_{\substack{\sigma \subseteq \gamma \\ \delta \subseteq \alpha_\beta^\sigma}} (-1)^{|\sigma|}.$$

For fixed $\delta \subseteq \alpha_\beta^\kappa$, denote by $\sigma(\delta)$ the unique minimal set $\sigma \subseteq \gamma$ such that $\delta \subseteq \alpha_\beta^\sigma$ ($\sigma(\delta)$ does not depend on σ). We now have

$$t_\beta = \sum_{\delta \subseteq \alpha_\beta^\gamma} a_\delta \sum_{\sigma(\delta) \subseteq \sigma \subseteq \gamma} (-1)^{|\sigma|}.$$

The inner sum is identically 0, unless $\sigma(\delta) = \gamma$, when it is equal to $(-1)^{|\gamma|}$. Note that we always have $\sigma(\delta) \subseteq \gamma_\beta$; indeed, $\alpha_\beta^\sigma = \alpha_\beta^{\sigma \cap \gamma_\beta}$. Hence, $t_\beta = 0$ unless $\kappa \subseteq \beta$. Otherwise, we may rewrite the requirement $\sigma(\delta) = \gamma$ as $\gamma + n \subseteq \delta$ (here, n is the index where (π_i) appears in (α_i)), and hence

$$t_\beta = (-1)^{|\gamma|} \sum_{(\gamma+n) \subseteq \delta \subseteq \alpha_\beta \cup (\gamma+n)} a_\delta.$$

We are specifically interested in $\beta = \kappa$. It is clear that the above sum includes $a_\gamma = a_{\gamma+n}$, and all the remaining summands take the form a_δ with $\delta \supsetneq \gamma$. Thus, after multiplying by $(-1)^{|\gamma|}$, the constructed (t_ξ) satisfies the required conditions. $\square$

Let $\vec{e}_\kappa$ denote the “base vector” $(e_{\kappa,\xi})$ with $e_{\kappa,\kappa} = 1$ and $e_{\kappa,\xi} = 0$ for $\xi \neq \kappa$.

Claim 3. The set A (and hence also B) is contained in

$$S = \overline{\text{span}}\{a_\gamma \vec{e}_\kappa : d \geq |\gamma| \geq |\kappa|, \text{diam}(\gamma) \leq k, \text{diam}(\kappa) \leq l\},$$

the smallest closed subgroup containing all elements $a_\gamma \vec{e}_\kappa$.

Proof. Fix some well-formed $(\alpha_i)_i$, and write $f(\alpha_\xi)$ as $f(\alpha_\xi) = \sum_{\kappa \subseteq \xi} c_\kappa$. One can check that this formula holds with c_κ given by

$$c_\kappa = \sum_{\substack{\gamma \subseteq \alpha_\kappa \\ \gamma \not\subseteq \alpha_\lambda \text{ for } \lambda \subsetneq \kappa}} a_\gamma.$$

The above sum only contains elements a_γ with $|\gamma| \geq |\kappa|$, and we may eliminate the terms with $|\gamma| > d$ because these vanish. Finally, if $\text{diam}(\kappa) > l$ then (because (α_i) is well-formed), we have $\text{diam}(\gamma) > k$ for all γ in the above sum, and hence the corresponding a_γ vanish.

It follows that $(c_\xi)_\xi \in S$. Since S is closed, also $A \subseteq S$. Finally, S is a group, so $A + B = A$, $A \subseteq S$ implies $B \subseteq S$. $\square$

We next bootstrap Claim 2 to a more precise statement.

Claim 4. In the situation of Claim 2, there exists $b = (b_\xi)_\xi \in B$ such that

- (1) $b_\beta = 0$ unless $\beta = \kappa$,
- (2) $b_\kappa = a_\gamma$.

Proof. It follows from Claim 2 that we may find for any γ, κ with $|\gamma| \geq |\kappa|$ and $\text{diam}(\kappa) \leq l$ a vector $(t_\xi)_\xi \in \Delta$ such that

$$t_\kappa = a_\gamma + \sum_{\delta \supsetneq \gamma} k_\delta a_\delta$$

for some integers k_δ . Applying this inductively with δ in place of γ and using that $a_\delta = 0$ for sufficiently large δ , we may eliminate all the summands a_δ above, so that $t_\kappa = a_\gamma$. Writing out t_κ in the coordinates, we thus find $b = (b_\xi)_\xi \in B$ such that $b_\beta = 0$ unless $\beta \supseteq \kappa$, and $b_\kappa = a_\gamma$.

Using a form of Gaussian elimination together with Claim 3, we may now produce for any $\varepsilon > 0$ an element $b \in B$ such that $b_\kappa = a_\gamma$ and $\|b_\beta\| < \varepsilon$ if $\beta \not\supseteq \kappa$ or $\beta \in \{\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \dots, \kappa_r\}$, for any finite list $\{\kappa_j\}_{j=1}^r$. Finally, using the compactness of B , we may use the above procedure to produce $b \in B$ such that $b_\kappa = a_\gamma$ and $b_\beta = 0$ if $\beta \neq \kappa$. $\square$

6.3. Final step. We are now in position to finish the proof of Proposition 5.4. Combining Claims 4 and 3, we see that $A = B$, and hence $\Sigma = \Delta$. But this means that Σ contains the constant sequence $\beta \mapsto 0$. Hence, there is some (α_i) such that $\beta \mapsto \alpha_\beta$ maps $\mathcal{S}_l$ to $\mathcal{S}_k$ (which additionally happens to be well-formed and generic) so that $\beta \mapsto f(\alpha_\beta)$ is as close to the constant sequence $\beta \mapsto 0$ (in the product topology of $\mathbb{T}^{\mathcal{F}_0}$) as we wish. Thus, we can extract an asymptotic $\mathcal{S}_l$ -subsequence of f which is identically 0, which was our goal.

6.4. Proof of Theorem A. Having proved Proposition 5.4 (and hence Theorem B) we discuss the proof of Theorem A. We are in the same situation as in Proposition 5.4, with the exception that we have $k = d$, and we need to take $l = 0$.

We apply the same argument as above, with some simplifications. A pattern is now (again) just a single set $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_k$. The appropriate version of Claim 1 is easily proved. The key difference in Claim 2 is that we can now prove it with $k = d$ and $l = 0$ (we may simply put $\pi = [3k] \setminus \gamma$, with notation therein). Neither Claim 3, not the remainder of the argument ever use the relation between k, l and d , so the reasoning carries through.

REFERENCES

- [AHG⁺63] Louis Auslander, F. Hahn, L. Green, Lawrence Markus, and W. Massey. *Flows on Homogeneous Spaces*. Princeton University Press, 1963.
- [Ber10] Vitaly Bergelson. Ultrafilters, IP sets, dynamics, and combinatorial number theory. *Ultrafilters across mathematics*, 530:23–47, 2010.
- [BFM96] Vitaly Bergelson, Hillel Furstenberg, and Randall McCutcheon. IP-sets and polynomial recurrence. *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems*, 16(05):963–974, October 1996.
- [BFW06] Vitaly Bergelson, Hillel Furstenberg, and Benjamin Weiss. Piecewise-Bohr sets of integers and combinatorial number theory. In *Topics in discrete mathematics*, volume 26 of *Algorithms Combin.*, pages 13–37. Springer, Berlin, 2006.
- [BL07] Vitaly Bergelson and Alexander Leibman. Distribution of values of bounded generalized polynomials. *Acta Mathematica*, 198(2):155–230, June 2007.
- [CS10] Omar Antolin Camarena and Balazs Szegedy. Nilspaces, nilmanifolds and their morphisms. September 2010.
- [Fur81] Harry Furstenberg. *Recurrence in Ergodic Theory and Combinatorial Number Theory*. Princeton University Press, 1981.
- [FW78] H. Furstenberg and B. Weiss. Topological dynamics and combinatorial number theory. *Journal d’Analyse Mathématique*, 34(1):61–85, December 1978.
- [Gre15] Ben Green. *Higher-Order Fourier Analysis, I*. Oxford, 2015. (Notes available from the author).
- [GT10] Ben Green and Terence Tao. Linear equations in primes. *Annals of Mathematics*, 171(3):1753–1850, June 2010.
- [GT12] Ben Green and Terence Tao. The quantitative behaviour of polynomial orbits on nilmanifolds. *Annals of Mathematics*, 175(2):465–540, March 2012.
- [Hin74] Neil Hindman. Finite sums from sequences within cells of a partition of $\mathbb{N}$. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 17(1):1–11, July 1974.
- [HK11] Bernard Host and Bryna Kra. Nil-Bohr sets of integers. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 31(1):113–142, 2011.
- [HSY14] Wen Huang, Song Shao, and Xiangdong Ye. Nil Bohr-sets and almost automorphy of higher order. July 2014.

- [Key66a] Harvey B. Keynes. Topological dynamics in coset transformation groups. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 72(6):1033–1036, November 1966.
- [Key66b] Harvey B. Keynes. Topological dynamics in coset transformation groups. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 72(6):1033–1035, November 1966.
- [Lei98] A. Leibman. Polynomial sequences in groups. *J. Algebra*, 201(1):189–206, 1998.
- [Lei02] A. Leibman. Polynomial mappings of groups. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 129:29–60, 2002.
- [Lei05] Alexander Leibman. Pointwise convergence of ergodic averages for polynomial sequences of translations on a nilmanifold. *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems*, 25(1):201–213, 2005.
- [McC99] Randall McCutcheon. An Infinitary Polynomial van der Waerden Theorem. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 86(2):214–231, May 1999.
- [TV06] Terence Tao and Van H. Vu. *Additive Combinatorics*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [ZK12] Pavel Zorin-Kranich. A nilpotent IP polynomial multiple recurrence theorem. page 32, June 2012.
- [ZK13] Pavel Zorin-Kranich. Ergodic theorems for polynomials in nilpotent groups. page 146, September 2013.

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, ANDREW WILES BUILDING, RADCLIFFE OBSERVATORY QUARTER, WOODSTOCK ROAD, OXFORD, OX2 6GG
E-mail address: jakub.konieczny@gmail.com